



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

---

## I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

In his introductory statement of the points agreed upon by the writers in the present discussion, as he apprehends them, my friend Prof. Harper has to some extent misconceived my attitude to the question before us, which I prefer to state in my own words.\*

If the critics were content with attempting a partition of Genesis (or even of the so-called Hexateuch) on purely literary grounds and with drawing what might fairly be reckoned legitimate inferences from such a partition, this would be a matter of curious interest but nothing more. The serious aspect of the affair is that there are presuppositions involved in the arguments employed and there are deductions made which are prejudicial to or subversive of the credibility and inspired authority of the sacred record. This constitutes the gravity of the case, so far as my view of it is concerned and so far as it affects the great body of those who reverence the Scriptures as the word of God. I am accordingly only concerned to show, first, that the partition proposed by the critics in itself and apart from unfriendly prepossessions warrants no such destructive conclusions; secondly, that many of the arguments urged in support of the current critical partition are clearly invalid.

A clear discrimination is to be made in the first place between the partition of the text itself, for which the critics contend, and the inferences professedly deduced from that partition. It is possible to accept the former and yet to retain

---

\* I do not object to the statement of the question at issue, *HEBRAICA*, p. 18, 6 (3), "*Are there really distinct documents? i. e. such as the analysis of critics of the present generation presents?*" provided it is not limited to the words in italics, but embraces the succeeding explanatory clause as well. It is the *current scheme* of Pentateuch division, adopted alike by critics so widely at variance in other respects as Wellhausen and Kuenen on the one hand and Dillmann and Kittel on the other, which is under discussion. This carries with it not simply the recognition of certain lines of partition, but a series of consequences uniformly regarded by its advocates as flowing from it, impugning the truth and the consistency of the sacred volume. The mutual relations of these supposed documents are accordingly of vital consequence and must necessarily be considered. That Prof. Harper and myself are really at one upon the point to be discussed is evident from the fullness with which he has set forth not merely the analysis, but its commonly accepted consequences.

the right to judge of the legitimacy of the latter. We find in Genesis a continuous, connected and self-consistent narrative, which has all the appearance of a true and veritable history, and, so far as it can now be traced, has always been so regarded by the people among whom it originated; and there appears to be no good reason for discrediting it. The mythical character attaching to the early record of pagan nations is not to be imputed to the biblical account of the primeval age of the world or of the origin of the Israelitish people. For the narrative of the Bible is absolutely unique. It stands alone among all the records of antiquity in preserving in its primitive purity the true knowledge of God, in its freedom from grotesque, mythological conceits, and in presenting a truly rational account and one which is strikingly confirmed in its main outlines at least, if not in all its details, by modern scientific research as no similar document of antiquity can pretend to be, in relation to the origin of the world, the unity of the human race, the primeval history of mankind and the filiation of nations. And as the preliminary stage in a grand scheme of divine revelation continued through succeeding ages, whose reality and supernatural character are attested by the most convincing proofs, it has a well-founded claim to be regarded as transmitting a faithful account of God's dealings with men from the beginning.

And there is an additional guarantee of the truth of Genesis in its Mosaic origin, which in spite of all critical clamor, in spite even of the concessions of eminent evangelical scholars, cannot be set aside. The laws from Exodus to Deuteronomy are, by their own positive claim, by ineffaceable internal indications and by both the express attestation and incidental historical confirmation of subsequent Scriptures, irrefragably Mosaic. And Genesis, which is clearly preliminary to the books that follow, must, as the critics themselves allow, have the same origin as they.

There is something clearly wrong in a critical process which can take a history that in itself is quite consistent and entirely credible, and sunder it into distinct documents which are mutually repugnant and irreconcilable. A purely literary analysis on grounds of diction, style and modes of thought, whatever it might reveal respecting the structure and formation of the book, obviously cannot impair the truth of that which is otherwise credible, or the consistency of that which in itself is harmonious. And in fact the damaging consequences attributed to the critical hypothesis result in great part from inferences resting not on positive data but on the critics. The fundamental vice in the whole process is that they quietly assume what they undertake to demonstrate.

We have the book of Genesis in its present form. According to the current critical hypothesis it was put together by a redactor from pre-existing documents. The portions extracted from each of these documents severally can, it is claimed, be recognized and assigned to the source from which they came. By combining paragraphs of kindred origin the primary documents can again be reproduced in

their distinct and separate state to that extent to which the redactor made use of them in his compilation. It is confessed, however, that no one of them can be restored in its completeness. There are evident breaks in their continuity. There are in each allusions unexplained in any existing paragraph of that particular document. Just how much has been dropped, or what was in the missing portions, cannot of course be known. This being the case, the allegation that a given passage had a meaning in the document from which it was taken, different from that which it obviously has in its present connection and especially a meaning at variance with the connection in which it now stands, is pure assumption on the part of the critic, for which in the nature of the case he can have no adequate justification. He has by his own admission the document in an imperfect state, with no means of filling acknowledged chasms or estimating the amount or the character of what has been omitted, and yet he presumes to challenge the work of the redactor, who by the hypothesis had the documents before him in their original completeness, and to convict him of incapacity or dishonesty. There can be no possible warrant for such a procedure, unless the terms of the paragraph in question are themselves in evident conflict with its existing context. That they are capable of a different interpretation and might be so explained in some other connection is nothing to the purpose. Many passages rent from their connection might have an entirely different meaning put upon them from that which they were intended to have.

So when it is affirmed that two or more paragraphs, which, as they now stand, describe distinct subjects or events, are nevertheless but variant accounts of the very same thing. Without the materials for the formation of a correct judgment it is arbitrarily assumed that the record in its present form is false, and that the redactor has either from ignorance or design combined his sources in a way that misrepresents their real meaning.

So too when a discrepancy is inferred from the silence of one document respecting matters set forth in another. How utterly gratuitous and arbitrary such inferences are, appears from the repeated instances in which from like premises precisely the opposite conclusion is drawn, the exigencies of the critical hypothesis itself compelling its advocates to assume that the redactor found the same thing recorded in two or more of the documents, but deemed it sufficient to extract a single account from one of them and hence passed the others by.

So also when the credibility of Genesis is undermined by alleging that the primary documents out of which it was compiled, were first committed to writing many centuries after the Mosaic age, this conclusion is notoriously and avowedly based on grounds which presuppose their unhistorical character and convert them into fluctuating myths and legends and assume likewise that all the rest of the sacred history has been tampered with and deliberately falsified.

And so in general it will be found that deductions from the critical hypothesis impugning the veracity of Genesis find no real warrant in the analysis itself, but rest upon conjectures and assumptions of the critics. They assume that the record is unreliable and untrustworthy; and every suspicion which their fertile fancy can suggest, however baseless, is accepted as a fresh proof that no dependence can be placed on its statements. It is no marvel if under such treatment its historical character is frittered away completely.

The critical partition of Genesis has been gradually elaborated during more than a century by a succession of scholars of the greatest eminence, who have expended upon it an immense amount of learning, ingenuity and patient toil, until they have at length brought it into a shape in which it is accepted with substantial unanimity by European critics of widely different schools of thought and every various grade of belief and unbelief. This is of course a very significant fact and is entitled to its full weight in the consideration of this subject. That cannot be lightly dismissed which has gained the approval of so many minds. Nevertheless it is not the weight of authority, but the force of the arguments, which is decisive. And the fluctuations of critical opinion in the past, and particularly the rapid and extensive changes which have taken place in the most recent times, caution us not to regard its present state as one of permanent equilibrium.

Some obvious grounds of doubt and hesitation offer themselves at the outset of a general nature which may be noted here.

1. The very ingenuity of the hypothesis and the perfection to which it has been brought, awaken the suspicion that its inventors may have been imposed upon by their own dexterity. In its present form it is a kind of universal solvent. With P, and J, and E, and the added resources of the old fragmentary hypothesis in the shape of P<sup>1</sup>, P<sup>2</sup>, etc., J<sup>1</sup>, J<sup>2</sup>, etc., on the one hand, and minute divisibility on the other, and R ever ready for any emergency in the way of transposition, modification, excision, insertion and readjustment *ad libitum*, and a latitude of conjecture which has no check but the pleasure of the operator, it seems versatile and pliant enough to be equal to anything. There is no mountain of difficulty over which it cannot work its way. There are no phenomena so adverse that it cannot be harmonized with them. It can either shape itself to accord with the facts, or can shape the facts to suit its own requirements. An argument that can prove everything, proves nothing, and one cannot escape the apprehension in the presence of a hypothesis of such universal adaptability that we may be dealing with a subjective creation rather than an objective reality, with skillfully constructed fancies instead of the actual state of the case.

2. This apprehension is increased by the rather impalpable nature of the subject dealt with and the precarious nature of the arguments employed. The wanderer in a trackless wilderness, with no compass and no fixed object to direct

his course, will almost inevitably diverge from a straight line, and may imperceptibly swerve more and more until at length he is moving in an opposite direction from that in which he started. So the very nature of the case renders it well nigh impossible that accurate results should be continuously reached in the manner attempted by the critics. The comparison of certain passages supposed to belong respectively to distinct writers, furnish various criteria of diction, style and sentiment. These criteria direct the division of new passages, which in turn supply additional criteria. And so the work proceeds step by step, each result attained being assumed as the basis of a fresh advance, the accuracy of which is conditioned by the exactness of every previous portion of the process. The liability to error in dealing with so many unknown quantities is very great from first to last; and there is no external standard by which to test the correctness of the results or to ascertain and remove the errors that have been made. And yet a slight deviation at the outset or anywhere along the line, which it might be impossible either to avoid or to detect, would vitiate all subsequent conclusions.

3. This liability to error is seriously increased by the critics' undertaking to deal with such minute quantities. In order to carry the hypothesis through it becomes necessary to sunder individual sentences, clauses and even words from their connection and assign them to authors distinct from the assumed writers of the surrounding context. This is not only precarious in itself, but gives rise to the suspicion that the critical division is regulated by foregone conclusions rather than by a fair consideration of the actual phenomena; and that this mode of manipulation is only a device for getting rid of what is really adverse to the hypothesis.

4. Connected with what has been said is the obvious danger that the critical arguments may prove to be but reasoning in a circle. The text is partitioned agreeably to a given hypothesis; every passage having certain characteristics is assigned to one writer and such as have certain other characteristics to other writers. And when the partition is complete it corresponds with the hypothesis, simply because it was made by the hypothesis.

It is freely conceded that certain phenomena, particularly in the earlier chapters of Genesis, seem to be best explained by the supposition that it was based in whole or in part upon pre-existing written sources. Before the publication of Astruc's "Conjectures," the Dutch theologian and commentator, Vitringa, expressed the belief that "various writings of their fathers were preserved among the Israelites, which Moses collected, digested, embellished, and supplemented." Such an assumption in itself considered, so far from invalidating the record, tends rather to give it additional confirmation, since it increases the number of witnesses and to a certain extent replaces oral tradition by documentary evidence. And it does not in any way affect the question whether the book in its present form is to be ascribed to Moses.

With these prefatory remarks my own attitude to the question under discussion may be briefly stated as follows :

1. The critical analysis of Genesis, so far as it is a purely literary inquiry and apart from the destructive consequences uniformly deduced from it by those who advocate and accept it, may be considered an open question to be determined by literary evidence.

2. The supplementary hypothesis is pressed with fewer difficulties than the documentary hypothesis now in vogue.\*

3. The methods and arguments by which the partition is effected are to so large an extent unsound and the conclusions drawn from them so insecure, that it is exceedingly doubtful whether any safe and satisfactory division in detail is practicable or any approach can be made in this way towards a reconstruction of the presumed original sources.

Prof. Harper divides the passage under review, Gen. 1:1-12:5, into four sections and states the views and arguments of the critics in respect to each of them severally. These sections are now to be examined *seriatim*, and in each of them inquiry will be made into

1. The alleged contradictions and discrepancies which are held to establish the existence of two independent narratives ; and it will be found that even though the critical partition were allowed, no such discrepancies exist.

2. The validity of the arguments by which the critical partition is defended.

---

\* One insuperable difficulty, as it seems to me, in the ordinary documentary hypothesis is its fundamental assumption that P and J constitute two distinct and independent documents prepared with no reference to each other. It is inconceivable that two separate treatises, written by different authors, neither of whom had any knowledge of the work of the other, could proceed so completely upon the same line in plan and contents. Prof. Harper is at pains (p. 66) to indicate the affinity of P and J in Gen. 1-12:9; he gives a summary of this section of the book under nine heads, each of which is treated in both documents and in the same order. So closely allied are they in fact that R has been able to produce a continuous, regularly unfolding history by piecing together alternate sections from one and the other. The critics may be safely defied to adduce a similar instance in all literature. Such a measure of correspondence cannot have arisen without design: and paragraphs borrowed from independent and unrelated sources cannot be so dovetailed together as to produce the impression of harmonious unity and uninterrupted connection. It was the embarrassment arising from this consideration which led to the substitution of the supplementary for the documentary hypothesis until the most recent school of critics found it necessary to fall back upon the latter, because the former could not be made to harmonize with their revolutionary ideas. If J did not write independently, but simply supplemented P, making additions to a pre-existing document for the sake of incorporating fresh material, the relationship of the parts both in general plan and in numerous minute particulars is more easily accounted for. Principal Cave (*Inspiration of the Old Testament*, p. 208) has recently and as I suppose independently offered the suggestion, first made, so far as I am informed, by Rev. Dr. Schaff, that J was Moses; beside which may be placed the conclusion of Delitzsch based on independent grounds that the "Jehovistic-Deuteronomic" style is the best representative of the primitive Mosaic type (*Neuer Commentar über die Genesis*, p. 20). Who knows whether the higher criticism itself may not yet lead up to the old traditional view of Moses' authorship?

## II. SECTION 1.—GEN. 1-3.

It is alleged, p. 20,\* that these chapters "contain two distinct accounts of creation" which differ so seriously in their "material," p. 27, in several respects, as to be incapable of being harmonized by any fair method of interpretation. Neither of these statements is correct. Ch. 2:4b-3:24, which is assigned to J, does not contain a second account of the creation additional to that of P 1:1-2:3. There is no lack of agreement between these two passages.

These points must be examined separately.

## 1. No Duplicate Account of the Creation.

1) That ch. 2:4 sqq. is not to be so understood in the intention of the writer is plain from the manner in which it is introduced. It is professedly not an account of the creation, but a sequel to that account. Ch. 2:4a, which is the title of the section that follows, announces as its theme "the generations of the heaven and of the earth, when they were created." This is the first of a series of similar titles to the several sections into which the Book of Genesis is divided. The history is parceled into "the generations of Adam," 5:1; "the generations of Noah," 6:9; "the generations of the sons of Noah," 10:1; "the generations of Shem," 11:10; "the generations of Terah," 11:27, etc., etc., to indicate its genealogical character. The proper frame-work of the history is the line of descent traced regularly from Adam to Jacob and his posterity. This line of descent is arrested from time to time in order to introduce such facts as are to be related, and then proceeds again from the point at which it had arrived. Divergent lines are traced, as occasion arises, to a sufficient distance, and are then dropped, the writer then uniformly reverting to the main line of descent, that of the chosen race, which is his principal theme.

The "generations" of Adam, Noah, etc., mean, as is required by the form of the Hebrew word (תולדות), its uniform usage and the contents of the sections so entitled, not the origin or ancestry of Adam, Noah, etc., but their descendants. Accordingly, when for the sake of a more precise correspondence with the titles that are to follow, this term properly belonging to the sphere of human relations is transferred to the material universe in the first title of the series (compare an analogous transfer for a like reason in Luke 3:38), "the generations of the heaven and the earth" must denote not their origin, how they were created or brought into being, but, so to speak, their progeny, that which sprang from them, man the child of heaven and earth, not in any mythical sense, but in the plain and obvious sense of the narrative, his body formed from the dust of the ground, his spirit breathed into him by God himself. It is not an account of the creation of the world that is here announced, but of the formation of man and the first stages of his history upon the earth.

---

\* All references, not otherwise specified, are to the last number of HEBRAICA.



This evident conclusion is not to be evaded by any critical device. Some would attach 2:4a to the preceding section, 1:1-2:3, as the summary of its contents. But this is impossible for a variety of reasons.

1. It is in violation of the uniform analogy of the whole series of similar titles, which invariably stand at the head, never at the close of the section which they describe.

2. This is confirmed by the identical structure of the immediately following clause here and in 5:1, where the connection is unquestioned. "In the day of Jehovah Elohim's making earth and heaven" follows the title "the generations of the heaven and of the earth" in precise conformity with "in the day of Elohim's creating Adam," after the title "the generations of Adam."

3. If 2:4a is a subscription to the preceding section, then 2:4b-4:26 is the only portion of the book without a title, while 1:1-2:3 will have two titles, one which is entirely appropriate at the beginning, 1:1, and one which is altogether unsuitable at the end.

4. On the divisive hypothesis the additional incongruity results, that when the section ascribed to J (2:4b-ch. 4) is excluded and the connection restored as it originally existed in P, 2:4a will be immediately followed by 5:1, and thus two titles will have stood in direct juxtaposition.

5. As the titles now stand they succeed each other in a perfectly natural order. (1) The creation of heaven and earth in the beginning; (2) the generations of heaven and earth, Adam and his family, the child of both worlds; (3) the generations of Adam traced to Noah and his family; (4) the generations of Noah, and so on.

6. "The generations of the heaven and of the earth" in its proper Hebrew sense does not correspond and cannot by any possibility be made to correspond with the contents of ch. 1, which records the creation of the world instead of giving an account of a being sprung from the world. Dillmann indeed explains it of organized and living things produced upon the earth in the onward progress of creation. But כְּהִרְאָם need not mean "while they were in the course of creation;" Hupfeld shows (*Quellen der Genesis*, pp. 110, 111) that it may as well mean "after they were created," Isa. 6:13; 30:14; 53:9. Even in the sense given to it by Dillmann, however, it would not be applicable to the whole, but only to a part of ch. 1. The firmament and the heavenly bodies, the seas and dry land are identical with the heavens and the earth, not their offspring. The creating and shaping the material universe cannot with propriety be included under the "generations" of the heavens and of the earth, and the writer of the chapter could never have expressed its purport in such terms. And even the vegetable and animal products, which by creative fiat were made to issue from the earth, were wholly of an earthly, not a heavenly, mold. It is not until v. 26 that the creation of man is reached. To the great body of the chapter its alleged subscription is

manifestly inappropriate, and man himself in ch. 1 is considered simply in his place in the general scheme of created things. He is introduced into the world; but there is no record of what befell him or his family, such as we are authorized to expect, such as is in fact given in 2:4b-4:26. Every similar title in Genesis is followed either by a history of the immediate offspring or by successive generations of descendants.

The inappropriateness of 2:4a as a title to ch. 1, which has just been exhibited, is equally valid against the critical suggestion, affirmed (p. 19) without proof or explanation, as though it were the most natural thing in the world, that it originally stood before 1:1 or in its place, but was removed to its present position by the Redactor. No writer, who understood the meaning of its terms, could ever have placed it there. Certainly not the writer who uses it so appropriately everywhere else in Genesis. Or if it was a suitable title for Gen. 1, what possible motive could a sensible Redactor have had for transposing it?

It follows from what has been said that, in the view of the author of 2:4a, and of the author of the Book of Genesis as at present constituted (whether these are the same or different persons), the section which the critics assign to J is not a repetition of that of P, but a sequel to it.

2) That this is really the relation of these two passages will further appear from an examination of their respective contents. Ch. 2 is not a second account of the creation which had already been described in ch. 1. The making of earth and heaven is not narrated but presupposed, 2:4b. No account is given of their formation. No mention is made of the sea and its occupants; none of the sun, moon and stars; none of covering the earth with its varied vegetation; but only of planting a garden in Eden and making its trees grow from the ground, vs. 8,9. When banished from Eden man was to eat "the herb of the field," 3:18, whose existence is thus assumed, but whose production is only spoken of in ch. 1. These particulars could not be omitted from an account of the creation. To say (as Dill.) that they may originally have been contained in ch. 2, but were omitted by R because they were treated sufficiently in ch. 1, is to make an assumption without a particle of evidence, which amounts simply to a confession that ch. 2 is not what it would have been, if the writer had intended to give a narrative of the creation, and that its omissions are with definite reference to the contents of ch. 1.

3) Ch. 2 is evidently throughout preliminary to ch. 3, the narrative of the fall. In order to make this intelligible it was necessary to explain, 1) the two constituents of man's nature, already intimated in the title to the section, which must be known to comprehend the form of the sentence pronounced upon him that dust must return to dust, v. 7, cf. 3:19; 2) the locality, the garden of Eden with its tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, vs. 8-17; 3) the actors, Adam and Eve, and their relation to each other, vs. 18-25. These particulars could not have been incorporated in ch. 1 without marring its symmetry.

That deals with the creation of the world at large. Everything is on a universal scale. And to introduce a detailed description of the garden of Eden, with its arrangements and man's position in it, would be quite inappropriate. The plan and purpose of ch. 1 made it necessary to reserve this for the following section, and it is accordingly given in ch. 2.

## 2. No Discrepancies.

There is no inconsistency between ch. 2 and ch. 1, as the critics pretend. In order to reach the description of the garden of Eden, the writer reminds his readers in precise conformity with ch. 1 that when earth and heaven were first made the former contained nothing for the subsistence of man. There was neither bush nor herb to serve him for food, 2:5. The threefold classification of 1:11,12, grass, herb and tree, is not repeated here, for grass was the food of beasts and not to his purpose. Bush **שיח** is used rather than tree **עץ**, to make the negative stronger. There was not only no tree; there was not even a bush. Subsequently trees, 2:9, as well as herbs, 3:18, are named as the plants yielding food for human use.

The reason given for the absence of food-bearing plants is twofold; there was no rain to moisten the earth and no man to till the ground.\* There is no variance here with ch. 1. The suggestion that if the land had just emerged from the water, rain would not be needed, leaves out of view that according to 1:9,10 the separation of the terrene and the aqueous elements was complete, and the earth was dry land, **יבשה**, before any plants appeared upon its surface. A well-watered garden with ever-flowing streams was to be the abode of man; and in anticipation of it, it was natural to refer to the need of rain. And there is no implication that man was made prior to the existence of vegetation, contrary to 1:12,27. For

1. Ch. 2 alleges nothing respecting the relative priority of man or plants. It does not deal with the general vegetation of the globe any further than to carry us back to a time when it did not exist. Of its actual production ch. 2 says nothing. Its positive statement is restricted to the trees of the garden of Eden, vs. 8,9. And we are nowhere informed that these were brought into being at the same time with "the herb of the field," 3:18, or "the grass," **דשא**. Nothing is said of the origin of grass and herbs or of trees outside of Eden except in ch. 1.

2. The existence of man is stated to be a condition of that of plants designed for human use, not as an antecedent but as a concomitant. His tillage is requisite, 2:5, not to their original production, but to their subsequent care and culti-

---

\* My friend, Dr. C. M. Mead, in a casual conversation on this subject, suggested what, if my memory serves me, was also maintained by Ebrard in a little tract on *Natural Science and the Bible* issued several years since, that the last clause of 2:5 is not connected with that which immediately precedes. "There was no plant (for there had been no rain) and there was no man." The critical objection is thus set aside entirely in a very simple manner.

vation. Jehovah planted the garden and made the trees grow in it, and then set man to till it (עָבַד v. 15 as v. 5).

3. The order of statement is plainly not that of time but of association in thought (see Driver's Hebrew Tenses, §§ 75,76; my Hebrew Grammar, § 276. d.; Prof. Harper's Hebrew Syntax, § 24. 2). V. 7, man is formed; v. 8, the garden planted and man put in it; v. 9, trees are made to spring up there; v. 15, man is taken and put in it. We cannot suppose (as Dillmann admits) the writer's meaning to be that man was made before there was any place in which to put him, and that he was kept in suspense until the garden was planted; that he was then put there before the trees, that were to supply him with food, had sprung up; and that after the trees were in readiness he was put there a second time. It is easy to deduce the most preposterous consequences from a writer's words by imputing to them a sense which he never intended. In order to pave the way for an account of the primitive paradise, he had spoken of the earth as originally destitute of any plants on which man might subsist, the existence of such plants being conditioned on that of man himself, 2:5. This naturally leads him to speak first of the formation of man, v. 7, then of the garden, in which he was put, v. 8. A more particular description of the garden is then given, vs. 9-14, and the narrative is again resumed by repeating that man was placed there, v. 15.\* As there was plainly no intention to note the strict chronological succession of events, it cannot in fairness be inferred from the order of the narrative that man was made prior to the trees and plants of Eden, much less that he preceded those of the world at large, of which nothing is here said.

Nor does ch. 2 contradict ch. 1 in respect to the order of the creation of man and of the lower animals. The allegation that it does rests upon the assumption that Waw Consecutive future necessarily implies a sequence in the order of time, which, as we have already seen, is not correct. The record is (v. 19), "And out of the ground Jehovah Elohim formed all the beasts of the field and all the fowls of heaven and brought them to Adam." According to Hebrew usage this need not mean that the birds and beasts were then first formed with the view of providing a suitable companion for Adam. And when the scope of the passage is duly considered it will be seen that this cannot be its meaning.

It is a significant fact that Dr. Delitzsch, who is an adherent of the document hypothesis and can be suspected of no bias against it, and who in all the former editions of his Commentary on Genesis found ch. 1 and ch. 2 at variance on this point, in the last edition, embodying his most matured views, affirms that there is no discrepancy whatever, that "*et formavit...et adduxit = et cum formasset*

\* The critics' assumption that vs. 10-15 (p. 20) or vs. 8b,10-14 (Dill.) is an interpolation, inasmuch as the description of the garden is a departure from strict narrative, which is afterwards resumed, as well as Budde's notion that the tree of life is to be erased from v. 9 and elsewhere as not belonging to the narrative originally, deserve notice only as illustrating the perfectly arbitrary standard of genuineness which is set up.

*adduxit*," and that this is both "possible in point of style and consonant to the mode of writing in the Bible history." Dr. Dillmann admits that the tense here used might antedate what immediately precedes, but insists that v. 18, "I will make him an help meet for him," implies that the animals were now made as well as brought to Adam. But to suppose that the beasts and birds were made in execution of this divine purpose is not only a grotesque conception in itself, but involves the incongruity that the Lord's first attempts were failures. If there are critics who account this "the natural interpretation" (p. 31) it is in the face of the whole Israelitish conception of Jehovah, as expressed in J and everywhere else. The beasts were brought to Adam not as the companion intended for him, but "to see what he would call them," i. e. to let them make their impression on him and thus awaken in his mind a sense both of his need of companionship and of their unfitness for the purpose. When this had been accomplished, Eve was made. The animals are here regarded simply with a view to this end. If the writer were describing the creation of the inferior animals as such, he would speak of all the orders of living things, not neglecting reptiles and aquatic animals. The principal thought is the Lord's bringing the beasts and birds to Adam; his making them is only referred to as subsidiary to this, with no intention of affirming anything as to the time when they were made.

Dr. Driver (Heb. Tenses, p. 106) finds it "difficult to believe that in the midst of a continuous piece of narrative, such as Gen. 2:19," the Waw Consec. future can be used where a pluperfect would have been in place. It is a familiar fact that Hebrew construction frequently coördinates what in occidental languages would preferably or even necessarily be subordinated. Thus, Gen. 44:22, "the lad cannot leave his father and he will leave his father and he will die," meaning "if he leave his father, the latter will die." Now when the stress lies upon the second of two verbs connected by Waw Consec. future, the sequence in time may be altogether in the second or principal verb and not in that which is in thought subordinate to it. Thus vs. 7,8, "he formed man....and planted a garden....and placed man there" is equivalent to "placed man in the garden which he had planted." Ex. 4:31, "The people believed and heard....and worshiped," i. e. and having heard they worshiped; of course hearing preceded believing. Deut. 31:9, "And Moses wrote this law and delivered it," i. e. he delivered the law which he had written; the delivery of the law was subsequent to the address to Joshua, vs. 7,8, but not the writing of it. In accordance with these analogies\* 2:19 may be

---

\* Numerous other examples of a like construction might be adduced, e. g. Gen. 18:2, "and he saw three men....and he saw and ran," i. e. when he saw, he ran. Gen. 24:65, Rebekah spoke to the servant before alighting from the camel. Josh. 2:22,23, "And they abode till the pursuers returned, and the pursuers sought them....and the two men returned," i. e. after the pursuers had vainly sought them the men returned. 1 Sam. 15:17,18, the anointing antedates the previous clause, however it be read. 1 Sam. 28:4, Saul could not have postponed the gathering of his army until the Philistines were encamped in Shunem. 1 Kgs. 13:12,13, "And his sons saw....and

equivalent to "the Lord brought the beasts which he had formed." And this construction seems to be demanded by the following considerations: 1) Throughout the chapter the order of thought is regarded rather than that of time; 2) the limited form of statement does not suit a general creation of the lower animals, but is shaped by the particular end in view; 3) the utterly unbiblical notion of God involved makes it incredible and impossible that the beasts were made with the design expressed in v. 18. The alleged discrepancy accordingly vanishes entirely.

Thus far the way is perfectly clear. The alleged inconsistencies do not exist in the record, but are of the critics' own making. It is surprising that they do not see that in their eagerness to create discrepancies in evidence of a diversity of writers they are cutting away the ground beneath their own feet. Glaring discrepancies might consist with the fragmentary but not with the documentary hypothesis. The manner in which these documents are supposed to be woven together, demands a high degree of skill and intelligence in the Redactor; and to allege at the same time, p. 70, that he "did not have insight sufficient to enable him to see that he was all the time committing grave blunders" is self-contradictory. Arguments that prove too much are as fatal to a hypothesis as arguments that prove too little.

### 3. The Critical Partition.

We are now to enter a more perplexed and difficult region, where the criteria are of a less tangible and decisive character. I do not wish here to be regarded as the advocate of any particular view, but simply as a seeker after truth, ready to accept whatever shall approve itself as in accordance with the facts of the case. We shall endeavor to feel our way gradually along, inquiring what the facts are and then what is their proper interpretation. Many of the critical arguments are manifestly unsound and irrelevant. They require to be carefully sifted, if that which may be really significant is to be distinguished from that which is not. In evidence of separate authorship, p. 21, arguments are drawn from "the language, the style, the material and the theology." The material of this section has already been to some extent considered; we now proceed to the language.

#### 1) THE LANGUAGE OF P.

Thirty words or expressions in 1:1-2:4 are alleged to be characteristic of P; but a slight examination is sufficient to show that they have not the weight which the critics attach to them

---

he said," i. e. his sons having seen.... he said. Isa. 37:5,6, "And they came to Isaiah" (they had already delivered their message to him, vs. 3,4) "and he said to them," i. e. they having come he said. Isa. 39:1, he heard before he sent; Dr. Driver suspects an error in the text because the form of expression differs from 2 Kgs. 20:12; but may it not be only another mode of saying the same thing? Jon. 2:4 (the Hebrew enumeration is adopted where this differs from the A. V.) goes back of v. 3, and is amplified in what follows, not reaching the point of time in v. 3 until v. 8. Zech. 7:2 goes back of v. 1, which is only reached again in v. 4. For examples of like construction with Waw Consec. preterite, see Ps. 7:15; Ezek. 17:15.

1. It is easy to produce such lists of any length, where they are plainly unmeaning. Any two opposite pages of a work by any author might be scrutinized, and the words and expressions in each which do not chance to occur in the other noted as characteristic of different writers and used as a basis for the division of the rest of the work, all paragraphs, sentences and clauses being assigned to one or to the other as they happen to correspond to the first or to the second of these pages. Knobel, besides giving full details of the peculiar style, conceptions and aims of the *Rechtsbuch* and *Kriegsbuch*, draws out a list on successive pages of about 100 words and expressions characteristic of each and not occurring in any other document of the Hexateuch, and yet no subsequent critic has accepted his analysis and no one believes that those imaginary sources ever existed. "What would be thought of an attempt to prove the *Ars Poetica* spurious, on the ground that the words *exlex*, *sesquipedalia*, *cotis*, *litura*, *quincunce* and the phrases *purpureus pannus*, *lucidus ordo*, *callida junctura*, *norma loquendi*, *in medias res*, *incredulus odi*, *sagax rerum*, *vivas voces*, *ore rotundo*, *decies repetita*, *laudator temporis acti*, the simile of the mountain and the mouse, and the proverbial saying *occupet extremum scabies*, occur nowhere else in the writings of Horace?"\*

2. The thirty words in question are swept together as with a drag-net, without discrimination. Hapaxlegomena and words of rare occurrence, which of course give no indication of a writer's habitual diction, are joined with the rest. The frequency with which a word occurs in one document or the fact of its absence from another is mechanically noted, without regard to the question whether there was occasion to use it. The use of synonyms in different sections is urged, but no inquiry made whether this is explicable on other grounds than the varying habits of distinct writers. This apparent reliance upon bulk rather than weight, upon multiplying examples without showing that any of them are really pertinent, awakens the suspicion that this may be but a great heap of chaff with very little wheat.

3. The distribution of these words in the Pentateuch is very remarkable and significant. It is such as to show in a glance to any one who is without a theory to support, that whatever they may or may not prove, they certainly do not favor the document hypothesis. These words, in so far as they recur again in a P section of Genesis, do so only in the account of the flood, and are then found again in the Pentateuch, for the most part, only in the legislation. When they do appear elsewhere in Genesis it is never in a P but always in a J section. Their restriction in Genesis to the narratives of the creation and of the flood might be explained in one or other of two ways. It would seem natural to trace it to common features in the subjects treated; the deluge was in a sense the undoing of

---

\* J. A. Alexander, *The Earlier Prophecies of Isaiah*, p. xxxi. The examples given of words peculiar to the *Ars Poetica* are of course merely specimens; if it were worth while, the number might be indefinitely increased.

the work of creation, and like expressions might appropriately be employed in describing them both. Or if with the critics, it be imputed to sameness in the choice of words by the common author of both, then upon their method of reasoning it must necessarily follow from the uniform exclusion of all these words from the remaining P sections of Genesis, that the accounts of the creation and of the flood are from a source quite distinct from the rest of the book. And when it is found that several of these same words recur again with considerable frequency in the legislation of the three middle books of the Pentateuch, it might perhaps be inferred that the author of that law (tradition calls him Moses) was in possession of a written history of the creation and deluge; and that in framing his own narrative of those events he adopted its expressions as far as he found it convenient to do so, and that he also borrowed its terms as he had occasion in formulating his laws. Whether there is sufficient warrant for such a conjecture is another matter. But it would at least harmonize with the facts as already stated, which is more than can be said of the ordinary form of the document hypothesis.

In the following classification of the words alleged as characteristic of P they are numbered as on p. 22, for the sake of readier reference. Of course those that occur only in this one passage, as well as those which are also found in passages assigned to J or E, should in fairness be stricken from the list. There is no propriety on any hypothesis in considering them peculiar to P.

a. Occurring nowhere in the Pentateuch but in Gen. 1:1-2:4.

(4) תָּהוּ (also Deut. 32:10 J), בָּהוּ, (7) רָקִיעַ (9) דָּשָׂא (also Deut. 32:2 J); (20) דָּמוֹת (also Gen. 5:1,3 quoted from 1:26).

b. Nowhere else in Genesis.

(14) תָּנִינִם (in Pent. only Ex. 7:9,10,12 P; Deut. 32:33 J); (24) כֶּבֶשׂ.

c. In creation and flood.

(2) בָּרָא (Gen. 5:1,2 from 1:27; 6:7 J; Ex. 34:10 (R?); Num. 16:30); (5) תְּהוֹם (Gen. 49:25 J; Ex. 15:5,8 E; Deut. 33:13 E); (16) פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמָלְאוּ (Gen. 1:26 with or without other words of like meaning is found several times elsewhere in P); (17) חֵית הָאָרֶץ.

d. In creation and ritual law.

(1) בְּרֵאשִׁית (in J Gen. 10:10; 49:3; Ex. 34:26; in E Ex. 23:19; nowhere in Pent. but Gen. 1:1 with prep. ב); (6) הִכְרִיל (implies inner distinction and so not the equivalent of פָּרַד, which denotes merely outward separation and

is used by P Gen. 10:5,32; 13:11 as well as J); (8) מִקּוֹה; (11) מֵאֲרֵת; (19) יָרָה (in J Num. 24:19); (26) צִבְאָ (in J Gen. 21:32; 26:26; Num. 32:27; E Gen. 21:22); (28) מִלְאָכָה (J Gen. 33:14; 39:11); (29) קָדַשׁ (in JE Ex. 19:10,14,22,23; 20:8; Josh. 3:5).

e. In creation, flood and ritual law.

(10) מִיָּן; (13) שָׂרַץ verb and noun; (15) הִרְמַשְׁת (J Gen. 7:8) רִמַּשׁ noun only in creation and flood in Pent. (in J Gen. 7:23); (18) צֶלֶם (Gen. 5:3 from 1:27); (21) זָכַר (also in Gen. 17 and 34 connected with circumcision); (22) נִקְבָּה; (23) נִקְבָּה; (25) אָכַלָה (P also uses אָכַל noun Ex. 12:4; 16:16,18,21 and מֵאֲכַל Gen. 6:21 which verse plainly shows that it is not the equivalent of אָכַלָה and substituted for it by J and E); (27) שָׁבַת verb (J Ex. 5:5; 16:30; 34:21; Deut. 32:28; E Ex. 23:12).

The above list contains all the words pronounced characteristic of P except (3) אֱלֹהִים which is reserved for future consideration;

\* As to the suggestion that J and E use בְּתוֹחֶלָה instead of בְּרֵאשִׁית, it is to be said that they never have occasion to speak of the absolute beginning of all things, which is here referred to, they only need a phrase meaning *at first*. They both use רֵאשִׁית as well as תוֹחֶלָה, and P would have done the same had there been occasion for it, just as both words are found in other O. T. writings, e. g. Ecclesiastes 7:8; 10:13 and Hosea 1:2; 9:10).



(12) יִתְּ in a "loose and general sense instead of שׁוֹם or שֵׁת," which is found as well in J Gen. 15:10; 18:8; 30:40; 39:4,8,20; 41:41, and in E, Gen. 40:3,13; 41:10,42,48; and (30) תּוֹלֶדֶת, which is so far from lending any support to the hypothesis, that it can only be classed as belonging to P, on the prior assumption of the truth of the hypothesis. It is assigned to P, not by reason of its environment, but notwithstanding the fact that it is here the title of a J section to which it is assumed that it has been transferred from a former imaginary position at the beginning of ch. 1, for which it is not suitable and where it

could never have stood. Again in 37:2 it introduces a section composed of alternate paragraphs of J and E, in which there is not a single sentence from P until 41:46, and then not another till 46:6. Still further, in 11:27 and 25:19 it is followed by long passages from J with scarcely anything from P. The natural inference of one who had no preconceived theory in the case, would be that these titles prefixed alike to J and to P sections were either suggestive of their common authorship or at least that they proceeded from him to whom Genesis owes its present form, be he author or compiler.

If the total absence of all these words from any P sections in Genesis except those of the creation and flood does not disprove unity of authorship, how does an absence not quite so absolute from J sections indicate diversity of authorship? Or what cogency is there in a method of argument which does not work both ways, which is held to be conclusive whenever it makes in favor of the hypothesis, but is quietly disregarded whenever it makes against it?

It may be safely said that the diction of 1:1-2:4 gives no aid or comfort to the hypothesis: how is it with that of J in 2:4-3:24?

## 2) THE LANGUAGE OF J.

Forty words and expressions are adduced as characteristic of J in this section; and they are held to be significant, p. 21, since "they occur in what purports to be a treatment of the same subject." It has already been shown that this is an error. The subject is not and does not purport to be the same. It is distinctly announced both in the title, 2:4a, and in the opening words, v. 4b, that what follows is not a fresh account of the creation, but its sequel, viz. the first stage of human history transacted upon the scene already prepared for it. Ch. 3 is a narrative of the fall and in no sense parallel to ch. 1, and ch. 2 is purely preliminary to ch. 3.

In fact it is as inconsistent with the hypothesis of the critics as with that of unity of authorship to find here two divergent stories of the creation. The Redactor does not place them side by side as two varying accounts, which he makes no attempt to reconcile, but lays before his readers precisely as he found them. There is no intimation that they are alternatives, one or the other of which may be accepted at pleasure. On the contrary ch. 1 and ch. 2 are recorded as equally true, mutually supplementary and to be credited alike. Inconsistency apart, however, it is supposable that a compiler might place side by side related statements drawn from distinct sources, when a single writer would have wrought the whole into one continuous statement, thus avoiding needless repetition. It is a fair question, therefore, why the facts in ch. 2 concerning the creation of man

and his location in Eden were not included in ch. 1, and thus the necessity obviated of recurring to a matter already partially treated. The reason is not far to seek. Ch. 1 deals with the creation of the world as a whole. The scale upon which it is wrought is that of heaven, earth and sea. Man is introduced simply as the crowning apex of the vast pyramid of created things. The details of ch. 2 would here have been quite out of place and have marred the symmetry and grandeur of the entire description. They were hence reserved for a more appropriate place, and this is in accordance with the method of the writer elsewhere. Each of the ten books of generations, p. 19, into which Genesis is divided, is in a manner complete in itself, though this may require a return to what has been already stated in a different connection. Cf. 4:25,26 with 5:1-6; 5:32 and 6:5-8 with 6:9-13; 10:22-25 with 11:10-16; 11:26 with v. 27; 25:12 with 16:1 sqq. etc., etc.

While the theme of ch. 2 is not identical with that of ch. 1, matters previously treated are to a certain extent brought under review again, though with a different design and under a different aspect. Now the critics allege that J differs from P in the terms applied to the same acts and objects, thereby showing that it is by a different writer. We shall examine the cases adduced, retaining the numbers of pp. 23,24 for easier reference.

(1) עֵשֶׂה for which P is said to use בָּרָא. But עֵשֶׂה is used ten times in ch. 1, and of the same things as בָּרָא. Cf. 1:1 with vs. 7,8; 1:26 with v. 27; 1:21 with v. 25.

(2) The divine names will be considered hereafter.

(3) שִׁיחַ הַשָּׂדֶה, עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה, 2:5; (17) חֵיט 2:19,20. שִׁיחַ *bush* instead of עֵץ *tree*, as 1:11,12, has been explained already, and J has עֵץ 2:9 sqq.; שִׁיחַ besides in the entire Hexateuch only Gen. 21:15 E. It is not surprising, therefore, that it is not found in P. But why has J bush of the *field*, herb of the *field*, beast of the *field*, while P has beasts of the *earth*, 1:24,25,30 and so 9:2,10? The open field is in tacit contrast with the enclosed and cultivated garden, see 3:18. "Beast of the field" is the ordinary phrase throughout the Bible. But terrestrial in contrast with aquatic animals, 1:21,22, and when the whole broad earth is spoken of, are naturally called beasts of the earth or land, cf. 1:29; Ex. 10:12,15 E.

(5) צִמְחָה 2:5 J, for which P is said to use תִּצְמַח 1:12; but P has צִמְחָה Lev. 13:37, and J has it but once outside of the present narrative, Ex. 10:5; Gen. 41:6,23 belongs to E, a distinct writer.

(7) הָאָרֶץ 2:5 J, while P has הָאָרֶץ. But

these are not precise equivalents, as is shown by their discriminating use, 2:5; 4:12,14. When tillage is spoken of or productive soil, אֲרָמָה is the proper word and it so occurs 30 times. As P never mentions this, he has no occasion for the word in that sense. אֲרָמָה is also earth as a material, Gen. 2:7,19; 3:19; Ex. 20:24, of which P does not chance to speak. The surface of the ground is expressed by either term both by P and J. Thus אֲרָמָה with רָמַשׁ (noun or verb) P Gen. 1:25; 6:20; 9:2; J Gen. 7:8; Lev. 20:25. עַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ Gen. 8:8 J, but עַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ v. 9; also Gen. 7:3; 11:4,8,9 J as well as Gen. 1:29 P; and but for the sharp critical practice which does not hesitate to sunder a clause from the midst of its paragraph, 8:13, with its עַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ would be assigned to P. The only thing at all peculiar is that while both P and J in numberless instances use אֲרָץ for the land of Canaan, אֲרָמָה is so used five times, four of which are referred to J, Gen. 23:15; Lev. 20:24; Num. 11:12; 32:11, and one to E, Ex. 20:12; and it is twice used by J for the whole earth כָּל מִשְׁפְּחוֹת הָאָרֶץ Gen. 12:3; 28:14, while the parallels כָּל גְּוֵי הָאָרֶץ Gen. 18:18; 22:18; 26:4, though in a J connection are each time referred to R.

(8) *יצר* form J is not, as alleged, the equivalent of *ברא* create P. The latter emphasizes the immediate divine act, the former is suggestive of the material employed. In Isa. 43:1; 45:7,12,18 *ברא* *יצר* and *עשה* are used together and in the same sentence of God's almighty creative work. *יצר* form is not inconsistent with the creative *fiat* (p. 30), Isa. 44:24,26-28. All that is said about "laboriously gathering materials, moistening the clay and shaping it by personal manipulation" belongs to the interpreter, not to the sacred record. The earth was moistened for the growth of plants, 2:5,6, not with a view to the formation of man. *יצר* occurs nowhere in the Hexateuch except in this chapter; in the only other instance in which J alludes to the creation of man, he uses *ברא* Gen. 6:7. And if the absence of *יצר* from the rest of J has no significance, why is there any in its absence from P? A noun derived from this root occurs twice in J, Gen. 6:5; 8:21, both times in the narrative of the flood. If any meaning is attached to this, it can only be to link the accounts of the creation and the deluge together, as before hinted, and to sever them from the rest of Genesis.

(11) *נשמת חיים* J, while P is said to use *רוח חיים* (twice, viz., Gen. 6:17; 7:15), and *רוח* of the Spirit of God, 1:2. But *רוח* also in J, Gen. 6:3; Num. 11:29. *נשמה* occurs in all six times in the Pentateuch, four times in D and twice only in J, once without *רוח* Gen. 2:7, and once with it, 7:22, where the critics say that *רוח* is an interpolation by R, for no other reason than that it does not suit the hypothesis.

(12) *שום* J, which P also uses Gen. 6:16 and often elsewhere; as to the allegation that P does and J does not use *נתן* in this sense see No. 12, language of P.

(13) *האדם* (37) *לאדם* common noun in J, proper noun in P. But J uses *אדם* as a proper noun 4:25 and P as a common noun, 1:26,27; 5:2. If the argument proves anything, it proves that 5:2 is by a different writer from vs. 3-5.

(22) *נחש* 3:1 J; "P uses *תנין*." But the words are not equivalents. *תנין* means *extended*, and is applied to creatures of unusual length, marine animals, Gen. 1:21, as well as serpents Ex. 7:9,10,12. The application of a generic term in one passage and of a specific term in another

to the same thing, does not argue diversity of writers, unless a man who has once spoken of a snake cannot vary his expression and call it a reptile.

These are all the words in which the language of ch. 2 is contrasted with that of ch. 1; and every variation is readily explained by the connection and by the shade of meaning to be expressed.

There are two other words and two grammatical constructions in which the language of ch. 2, 3 is contrasted with that of P elsewhere.

(19) *כנר* 2:21 J for which P's equivalent is said to be *כסר*; but this latter only occurs once in the entire Hexateuch, Gen. 8:2; and P uses *כנר* Ex. 14:3.

(36) *הרבה ארבה* 3:16 J but twice beside in Hex., J 16:10, and R 22:17, who, according to Dillmann, has made a free addition of his own. In Ex. 32:13 J *ארבה* is without the infinitive, though based upon Gen. 22:17. How J could quote R, who by the hypothesis was subsequent to his time, it is not for me to say. But if J uses this combination in two places, and failed to employ it when there was such an obvious reason for his doing so, what is there surprising in its absence from P, who, moreover, does use the infin. abs. with the finite verb in other cases, e. g. Ex. 31:14,15; Lev. 7:24; 10:18.

(38) *שמע לקול* 3:17 occurs in but two passages besides in J, Gen. 16:2; Ex. 4:8,9. Ex. 3:18; 15:26; 18:24 belong to E. Commonly *שמע* has a different construction in J as it has in P.

(41) *נרש* in P only in Qal, it is said, while in J it is mostly in Piel. J has the Piel twice in Genesis, 3:24; 4:14, and three times in the rest of the Hexateuch, Ex. 2:17; 6:1; Num. 22:11, and the Qal once, Ex. 34:11, whereas in P it is the participle that is used. The Piel and Pual participles nowhere occur, their place being apparently supplied as in some other verbs by Qal forms. Moreover, as the tense-forms in Piel differ from those of Qal in the vowels only, how could J have written differently, if he meant to use the Qal in every case, unless he had the Massoretic points at his command?

These expressions are of so infrequent occurrence in J itself, that their not chancing

to be found in P warrants no inference of diversity of authorship.

In the remaining instances adduced it is not pretended that P and J express the same thought by means of different words or constructions, but simply that certain words or forms occur in J which are either not found at all or not with the same frequency in P. These are entirely irrelevant, and are so admitted to be, p. 24, unless two things are first shown, viz.:

1. That they are wanting in P for some other reason than simply that he has no occasion to use them. If J does and P does not say (6) *מטר* *rain*; (10) *אפים* *nose*; *אף* *anger*; (14) *חמור* *desire* and (33) *עקב* *heel*, what of it? Are we to infer that P did not know the names of the members of the body, or the words expressive of ordinary emotions or of familiar objects? If he wished to say "nose" or "heel," what else could he call them?

2. That their apparent absence from P is not itself due to the critics' having systematically shaped the sections which they assign to P so as to exclude them. If the documents P and J existed in a separate state, their respective diction could with some confidence be compared. But when the separation is first made by the critics themselves at their own pleasure, and the criterion of division is the assumed diction of each, the result corresponds with the hypothesis for the simple reason that it was fixed by the hypothesis. How can it be expected that a given word will be found in P, when its presence in any passage or clause is held to be decisive proof that the latter does not belong to P?

As no attempt is made to establish either of these points in respect to the rest of the words adduced as characteristic of J, there is absolutely nothing in them that calls for a reply. And there would not be, if the list were ten times as long. Arguments that prove nothing become no more cogent by being multiplied; unless the intention be to create the impression that where there is so much smoke there must be some fire. Identity of authorship is neither proved nor disproved by summing up the words in different paragraphs and estimating the proportion of those that are the same or that are unlike.

But besides this fatal defect in the argument, several of these words are of no force for the purpose for which they are adduced for the further reason that they are of rare occurrence and hence afford no indication of a writer's habitual diction.

Thus (9) *נפח* Gen. 2:7, (18) *בנה* spoken of God, 2:22, (23) *ערום* 3:1, are found nowhere else in the Hexateuch. The noun *עור* (15) occurs nowhere in J except in 2:18,20, and the corresponding verb only occurs in J twice, Gen. 49:25; Deut. 32:33. The combination (6) *כננר* 2:18,20 is found nowhere else in the Bible, and *ננר* itself but twice besides in J in Genesis, 33:12; 47:15. The verb *פקח* (25) occurs nowhere in J but in Gen. 3:5,7; an adjective derived from it is found once in J Ex. 4:11 and but once besides in the Bible. (26) *שכל* 3:6 occurs but once besides in J, Gen. 48:14. (27) *חבא* Gen. 3:8,10 occurs again in an E context, where Dillmann thinks it was "probably an insertion from J," and six times in Joshua, where it is in each case uncertain whether it belongs to J or not. (34) The noun *עצב* 3:16 occurs nowhere else in the Hexateuch; *עצבון* 3:16,17, but once besides in the Bible, 5:29, with direct allusion to the former passage. The verb *עצב* occurs in the Hexateuch three times, Gen. 6:6 J; 34:7, which is sandwiched between two verses of P and is itself a curious critical conglomerate, having a phrase of D and another of E, but all assigned to J on account of *עצב* and *חרה*; and finally 45:5, which is in an E connection; but both verbs occur again and without regard to strict consistency with the former decision a compromise is effected and one is assigned to J, the other to E. (35) The noun *הרון* 3:16 is found nowhere else in the Bible. The cognate verb *הרה* is in Gen. 21:2 referred to P by Dillmann; but Kautzsch and Socin cut out the clause and assign it to J avowedly on the ground that it always belongs to either J or E.

The only words in the whole list that have any show of plausibility are the particles, viz. (4) *טרים*; (20) *הפעם*; (21) *כן*; (24) *פן*; (28) *איה* or *איה*; (29) *לבלתי*; (30) *זאת*; (39) *בטעבור*; (40) *עתה*. Such words of relation are not so directly determined by the subject treated and hence might seem to betray more the writer's style of thought. But even here

the bare fact of their occurrence or non-occurrence in certain paragraphs is not of itself an available argument. It must first be shown that they occur in one and not in the other, where there was equal occasion for employing them, and that the paragraphs have not been adjusted with the view of including or excluding them according to a preconceived hypothesis. The reasonableness of this demand may be illustrated by a few examples. **טָרַם** occurs but once in J in Genesis (2:5), and **בָּטָרַם** but once in J in Genesis (45:28), unless Dillmann is

right as against Wellhausen in assigning 37:18b to him; and yet Dillmann in 27:4,33 makes **בָּטָרַם** a mark of E in distinction from J. Gen. 30:20b in an E connection is attributed to J simply because **וְהָפְעָם** must always belong to him. Knobel and Nöldeke were inconsiderate enough to allow Ex. 15:23 with its **עַל כֵּן** to P, but other critics have since come to the rescue and taken it from him. Nöldeke also gave Lev. 20:4; Num. 9:7 to P; but the presence of **לְבִלְתִּי** in these verses has determined later critics to assign them differently.

How much weight critics themselves attach to the arguments thus far reviewed, even when fortified by the additional considerations drawn from the style and the theology of these opening sections, appears from the statement, p. 24, "The first chapter of Genesis is supposed by most critics not to be original with P, but to have been incorporated by him in his work from some outside source. If this is true, it should not be cited as a specimen of P's style." It is added immediately after, "Ch. 2:4b-3:25, on the other hand, is an excellent specimen of J." But the venerable Dr. Reuss, the father of the present reigning school of criticism, is of a different mind. He declares positively,\* "The Jehovist did not write chs. 2,3," and expresses grave doubts about the ascription to him of any of the passages attributed to him in Gen. chs. 1-11, adding that the old supplementary hypothesis can scarcely be escaped in dealing with some of these passages. Wellhausen†, too, the acknowledged leader of the school, has reached the same conclusion in respect to Gen. chs. 2,3 on different grounds, contending that it was not written by the J of the rest of Genesis or of the Hexateuch generally. When the critics are thus at variance, who is to decide between them? and what is to be thought of the arguments from diction, style and theology, as tests of authorship, which eminent scholars can thus unceremoniously set aside as inconclusive? So that, after toiling through these alleged marks of P in ch. 1, and of J in chs. 2,3, we are told at last, on high authority, that P did not write the one nor J the other, and that all the supposed criteria are meaningless.

Before leaving the diction of these chapters, attention should be drawn to some indications that they are not, as has been claimed, from separate and independent documents. It is generally conceded that the use of **יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים** throughout chs. 2,3, is a tacit reference to ch. 1. This combination of divine names occurs nowhere else with such regularity and frequency, though it is found sporadically in other passages, e. g. Ex. 9:30; 2 Sam. 7:22,25; 1 Chron. 17:16,17; Jon. 4:6. This both relieves it from the charge of being "an un-Hebraic expression," p. 23, and sets aside Hupfeld's notion that it is adopted here without refer-

\* *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, p. 255 sqq.

† *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 13.

ence to ch. 1 as peculiarly appropriate to the state of paradise, from which there is a descent to Jehovah alone after the fall, just as P is supposed to rise from Elohim in the patriarchal period to Jehovah in the days of Moses. The union of the names is intended to suggest that Jehovah now first introduced is identical with Elohim before spoken of in ch. 1. It is employed with evident allusion to the contents of ch. 1, and it pervades chs. 2,3. The critics say that Elohim was here introduced by R, though he is ordinarily chary of meddling with the divine names. But this must be viewed in connection with various other indications which enter into the tissue of these passages and are not so easily disposed of.

Note, for example, such facts as the following: If the construction of בְּרֵאשִׁית 1:1 adopted by Dillmann and favored p. 22 is correct, there is a remarkable similarity in structure, the more striking because it is unusual in Hebrew style, between P 1:1-3 and J 2:4b-7; a noun with ב in construction before the following verb begins the sentence, a circumstantial clause of some length is then introduced, and the principal sentence is continued by a future with a Waw Consec. J 2:4b strikingly resembles P 5:1b in the form of expression; so do 1:4a P and 6:2a J; 1:31a, 6:12a P, 8:13b J. אֶרֶץ without the article 1:24 P as

2:4 J. The paronomasia תָּהוּ וּבָהוּ 1:2; פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ 1:22,28 P recalls in J אֲדָמָה.... אָדָם 2:7; עֵפֶר וְאֶפֶר נָע וְנָה 4:14; verse 23; אִישׁ 18:27. The first pers. plur. used of God, 1:26 P, notwithstanding the strictness of Hebrew monotheism has its counterpart in J 3:22; 11:7. 2:4b J is an explicit allusion to the preceding account of the formation of the universe, as 5:1b is to that of the creation of man. The use of יָשָׁה made 3:1 J in reference to the beasts instead of נִצָּר formed as 2:19 J, is a reminiscence of 1:25 P. כְּרוּבִים cherubim 3:24 J occurs in the Pentateuch besides only in P.

In addition to verbal coincidences and allusions, the distribution of the matter between these two sections gives evidence of pre-arrangement and cannot be purely accidental. This is recognized p. 27, in calling one "generic" and the other "individual." The creation of the world at large, heaven, earth and sea with all that they contain, is stated in ch. 1 and assumed in ch. 2. The latter simply gives details, which were necessarily passed over in the plan of the former, respecting the separate formation of man and woman and fitting up the garden for their habitation. Ch. 2:19 is the only apparent exception to the specific and limited character of this section. But even this is no real exception, since it is obvious, as has already been shown, that what the writer really means to say and what according to the laws of Hebrew speech he does say, is not that the beasts were originally made with the motive stated in v. 18, but that this furnished the occasion of God's bringing them to Adam to receive their names. Again, God gave names to certain things in ch. 1, Adam gave names to others in chs. 2,3; and these are precisely adjusted to one another, neither duplicating nor omitting any. God gave names to day and night, heaven, earth and seas 1:5,8,10, and to Adam 5:1. Adam gave names to the inferior animals 2:20 and to Eve 2:23, 3:20.

And while it is plain that chs. 2,3 is thus adjusted to ch. 1, it is no less clear that 1:1-2:3 anticipates what is to follow and purposely prepares the way for it. 1. The emphasis with which it is repeated at the close of each creative act "and God saw that it was good," 1:4,10,12, etc., and affirmed at the end of the whole

"behold, it was very good," v. 31, would be unmeaning except as a designed preliminary to the reverse which was shortly to follow in the fall ch. 3. And this moreover is necessary to explain the otherwise unaccountable declaration 6:11 that "the earth was corrupt before God," the mystery of which is unrelieved by anything that P contains.

2. Ch. 2:3 is evidently preliminary to the fourth commandment Ex. 20:8-11, which again in its terms distinctly refers back to 1:1-2:3. The ten commandments in Ex. 20 are by the critics referred to E, with which according to Dillmann J was acquainted. He must, therefore, have known and believed that the world was created in six days, and can have written nothing in Gen. chs. 2,3 inconsistent with this belief. This can only be evaded by alleging that the commandments are not preserved in Ex. 20 in their genuine original form. Dillmann disputes Ex. 20:11, because a different reason is given for observing the Sabbath in Deut. 5:15. But Ex. 20 is the authentic transcript, while Deut. 5 is a reproduction with hortatory modifications. This Dillmann admits in other instances; but Delitzsch very properly contends that this is no exception. The rejection of the verse is simply the usual device of the critics for disposing of whatever contravenes their hypothesis. Instead of adapting their hypothesis to the phenomena presented by the text, they insist upon remodeling the text into accordance with their hypothesis. The advantage of this method is that the critic can thus triumphantly establish whatever he sets out to prove.

The inner relation of the early chapters of Genesis and of the various sections in this book and in the rest of the Pentateuch which are held to be most closely connected with them severally, is of prime importance in determining the constitution of the Pentateuch and in seeking to obtain a satisfactory view of the method in which it originated. Adopting the critical nomenclature P and J as convenient designations of the portions to which they are ordinarily applied, without any prepossessions for or against their original separateness, it may be confidently affirmed that they cannot possibly represent independent and unrelated documents, as the critics commonly assume, as though each was written without reference to the other and with no knowledge of its existence. Pursuing the same general plan and running parallel to each other to such an extent that they were capable of being intertwined as we now find them, having besides so many points of connection in the way of direct allusions or presuppositions and implications, such as we have already discovered and as will appear more and more as we advance, they certainly have much more in common than can be explained as fortuitous coincidences of quite independent writers.

And when the critics go farther and, for the sake of making their original separateness more complete, claim that P and J are in repeated instances mutually inconsistent and contradictory, their hypothesis is suicidal. No intelligent redactor could have combined them as they are combined.

### III. SECTION 2.—GEN. 4,5.

It is affirmed 1) that the genealogy preserved by J ch. 4:1,17-22 and that given by P ch. 5 are not, as they appear to be, two separate lines of descent from Adam, but are "practically the same," p. 36. One and the same list of names has by some blunder been attached to different ancestors, and been converted into two races of opposite character, that of ungodly Cain and of godly Seth. 2) That ch. 4 J is at variance with itself and with other parts of the J document.

#### 1. The two Genealogies not Identical.

Their identity is asserted purely on the ground of the remarkable similarity of names, p. 35. But

1. This is to set aside explicit and repeated historical testimony for no other reason than mere conjecture. It is gratuitously assumed not only that two genealogies recorded respectively by J and by P are the same, though professedly different; but this though on the critics' own theory P's genealogy is independently confirmed by J. The line Adam, Seth, Enosh is traced Gen. 4:25,26 J as well as 5:3-6 P, and as the critics assign 5:29 to J as another fragment of the same, p. 36 (1), these broken and scattered links in J utter the same voice with the more complete record of P, declaring that Noah and his father Lamech were descended not from Cain but from Seth. The distinctness of the two lines is moreover positively affirmed by calling Seth "another seed instead of Abel whom Cain slew."

2. It requires a vast amount of critical manipulation to get rid of this testimony. In 4:25 the word "again" in the first clause, and the whole of the last clause after the word **וְאֵת** viz. "another instead of Abel whom Cain slew" must be thrown out as an interpolation by R. The statement 4:1 that Cain was the son of Adam and Eve must be gotten out of the way to make him the same as Kenan the son of Enosh 5:9. The story of Cain and Abel must have been removed by R from its original place at a later point in the history. And Abel, as Wellhausen does not hesitate to say, is another name for Jabal, 4:20, of the sixth generation after Cain. All this wonderful medley is for the sake of consistently carrying through a conjecture, which implies that R was devoid of sense, and that neither P nor J understood the materials which they had before them, but which are so obvious to modern critics.

3. But it is said "It cannot be called a mere coincidence that the names are so nearly alike." Is it then an unheard-of thing that different persons should bear the same name? Does it discredit the roll of the kings of England, that the succession Edward-Richard-Henry occurs more than once in the course of it? If some one should affirm the identity of the German emperor Maximilian with the late unhappy ruler of Mexico, or of Saul the king of Israel with Saul of Tarsus, or of General Butler with the chief Butler of Pharaoh in the time of Joseph, would it be thought best to reconstruct history on this basis?



Delitzsch directs attention to the fact that but two names are the same in the entire series, viz. Enoch and Lamech. The first means *initiation* or *consecration*, and might very well be applied in the former sense to the first son of Cain born in exile as subsequently to the first born of Reuben, Gen. 46:9, and in the latter sense to that holy man who walked with God and was not for God took him. The meaning of the name Lamech is unknown: but the identification of the persons so called is forbidden by the speeches preserved from them, which reflect totally diverse characters. Cain and Kenan, Irad and Jared are distinct not merely in their form but in their radical letters and probable signification; so is the second and determining member in the compound names Methushael and Methuselah. The statement, p. 36 (5), that "a slight alteration has taken place" in these names is simply a confession that they are not the same. The hint, p. 36 *note*, of "a desire on the part of the writer to give to the descendants of Cain names with a bad meaning and to the descendants of Seth names with a good meaning" appears to find some confirmation in Mahalalel *praise of God* which stands over against Mehujael *smitten of God*.

Does not this in fact suggest a plausible solution of the whole mystery? The meaning of the most of these ancient names cannot now be ascertained. It is natural to suppose, however, that they are Hebrew representatives either of the names actually borne by these antediluvians or of appropriate designations subsequently applied to them. The disposition to produce like-sounding contrasts shown in Isa. 5:7, **מִשְׁפַּח-מִשְׁפָּט**, **צִדְקָה-צָדִיק**, or by slight modifications, as of Beelzebub into Beelzebul, or Shechem into Sychar, to give a different turn to the meaning of words may have ruled in producing the parallelisms of these lists, in which the same or similar names may have had different though appropriate senses. The fact also that the LXX. has two more names common to both lists than the Hebrew, suggests the tendency in such cases to come into a closer approximation in the course of repeated transcription.\* That the larger portion of these names is no longer capable of a satisfactory explanation is not surprising, considering their very high antiquity and the multitude of other proper names which were doubtless significant at first, but which are not explicable now.

4. Gen. 5:3 does not necessarily imply that Seth was the first child of Adam, any more than Ex. 2:1,2 implies that Moses was the oldest child of his parents, though v. 4 declares the contrary, not to speak of Ex. 7:7.

## 2. No Discrepancy in Gen. ch. 4.

It is said that 4:17-24 is at variance with the rest of the chapter and with the J document generally in respect both 1) to the life of Cain and 2) the fact of the deluge. It is hence claimed that it must be considered to be an extract from some older document, J<sup>1</sup>, which has been incorporated in J.

\* Cf. "Kabil" and "Habil," the Mohammedan names for Cain and Abel. Sale's Koran, note to ch. 5:30.

1. J represents Cain, vs. 11,14, as condemned for the murder of his brother to be a fugitive and vagabond in the earth; according to J<sup>1</sup> he led a settled life and built a city, v. 17. *a.* It then remains to be accounted for, if these stories are in such direct antagonism, how R could have put them together without explanation or remark, as though he perceived no conflict between them and had no idea that his readers would suspect any. *b.* The fact is, that Cain was expelled from the seat of God's presence, the society of man and cultivated land to the wild steppes of the land of Nod (so called from נֹד in his sentence, equivalent to the Nomad region). The Hebrew עִיר *city* is in usage broad enough to cover a nomadic encampment, Num. 13:19, cf. 2 Kgs. 17:9. The dread lest his murder might be avenged, v. 14, betrayed itself afresh in his constructing such a defence for himself and his family, which subsequently may have grown from these small beginnings into much larger proportions.\* The builders of the first huts on the site of Chicago may be said to have laid the foundations of that city. *c.* Cain had previously been a tiller of the ground. That he continued to be "an agriculturist," p. 60, is certainly not stated in the text, and is in fact inconsistent with it. The arts developed by his descendants are those of nomads, viz., pasturage, music and mining, but not the cultivation of the soil. Jabal was "the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle" in a very different sense from that in which Abel was "a keeper of sheep" at his paternal home.

2. That these nomadic arts could not have been developed prior to the deluge or that the fact of such development would not have been mentioned by the writer, had he known of the deluge, is certainly not obvious enough to justify the assertion, p. 60, that "this could have been written only by one who knew of no interruption of human history by the deluge."

*a.* It is said in defence of this astonishing statement, p. 37 (10), that this "gives us the origin of the arts as they existed in the time of the writer." But this leaves out of view the fact that agriculture and all that pertains to it is not one of these arts, and yet to the Hebrew mind this was the chief of human occupations, the one most favored and principally regarded in their national constitution and upon which their whole scheme of life was based. Such an oversight on the part of J<sup>1</sup> becomes all the more unaccountable upon the critical hypothesis that it was written after the settlement in Canaan. So far is it from being true that "the three sons of Lamech are made the fathers of the world, classified according to types of civilization," p. 61 (5).

*b.* That the genealogy of Cain breaks off, as it does, without being continued, like every other genealogy in Genesis, to tribes or persons existing in the writer's own day is a strong presumptive evidence that the race was extinct. Wellhausen intrepidly suggests that Cain is a collective name for the Kenites, Num. 24:22,

---

\* Observe the form of statement in the Hebrew, which is significant, וַיִּבְנֶה "he was building a city" as a work in progress, not "he built it," as though it was completed by him.

p. 37 (10), who are thus traced up to the origin of mankind; a piece of historical criticism akin to that which finds an allusion to South America in "the gold of Parvaim," 2 Chron. 3:6, since Parvaim is the dual of Peru.

c. The allusion in 4:24 to v. 15 plainly shows that the narrative of Lamech belongs to the same record with that of Cain and Abel. Dillmann can find no escape from this but either by putting the cart before the horse and supposing that the allusion is the other way, so that the language of Lamech may have given rise to the story of Cain's murder, or else by ejecting the troublesome clause from the text as an addition by R. It is said without further explanation, p. 60 (6), that "a study of the different senses in which **יָקַם שְׂנֵעִתִּים** is used in these passages, serves really to support the idea of different authorship." The different senses amount to this, that Cain was to be avenged by the Lord; Lamech boasts that he will be avenged in a higher measure by weapons that he carries himself. But how this supports diversity of authorship remains to be shown. The appeal to Budde, p. 60, *note*, means just this, that if he is suffered to change the text and convert the passive into an active verb, he can thereby render the reference to v. 15 inappropriate.

### 3. The Critical Partition.

#### 1) THE LANGUAGE OF P.

It is intimated (p. 33) that the whole of ch. 5 except a few words is characteristic of P. Precisely the contrary is the fact, as any one can see who approaches the subject without bias and with no hypothesis to support. There is no reason for connecting this chapter with P any more than with J, or for supposing that this genealogy ever formed a part of the document P before it was included in the Book of Genesis.

1. It is linked to the same extent and in precisely the same manner with P and with J. After the opening title, which will be considered apart, 5:1-3 borrows the language of 1:26-28 P; 5:29 that of 3:17 J. The genealogy is traced from Adam to Noah and his three sons, all of whom are alike named in P and in J. "Called his" or "their name," 5:2,3,29, corresponds with 4:25,26 J; **קָרָא**\* as a verb comparatively rare, 5:5 as 3:22 J; "walked with God," 5:22, coincides with 6:9 P. Beyond these express allusions to and coincidences with P and J alike, there is nothing to ally it with either. The critics say that 5:29 is an insertion by R. They do so simply because their hypothesis requires it and for no other reason. There is precisely the same ground for saying that R inserted 5:1,2 and modified 5:3. Both passages stand on the same footing, and should be dealt with in the same way. The natural inference from the facts of the case is that the writer of Genesis had before him an old genealogical register from which he extracted the

\* Found also Gen. 11:12,14; 25:7 in a genealogy or a statement extracted from a genealogy, and besides in the Hexateuch only Ex. 1:16 E, 33:20 J, Num. 21:8,9 E, Lev. 18:5 (Dillmann doubtful whether P or J), 25:35 (Dillmann P): Kayser denies that either is from P.

statements of this chapter (as subsequently 11:10-26), and in doing so he inserted these allusions to what he had already written.

2. In this way the peculiarity of the title of ch. 5 finds its most satisfactory explanation. "This is *the book* of the generations of Adam." This form of expression does not recur again. In drawing from the beginning of this old volume, its exact title is retained. And the remaining titles of Genesis, which, as we have seen, occur in P and in J connections alike, are framed upon this model; only, as they were not separate books, they are not so called, but simply "these are the generations," etc.

3. The form of the pre-Abrahamic history is thus best accounted for. This ancient genealogical history supplies the framework, and the narrative is inserted between its links. The line of descent is traced regularly to Noah when the departure from analogy in naming three sons, 5:32, instead of one, and arresting the genealogy, imply that an important epoch has been reached. The narrative of the deluge is then inserted (including the time of its occurrence, 7:6,11), after which the unfinished term in the genealogy is completed, 9:28,29, in language identical with ch. 5.

Ch. 5 certainly does not support the current critical hypothesis. So far as it indicates anything, it throws its weight in favor of the still older hypothesis of Vitringa.

## 2) THE LANGUAGE OF J.

The numbers are those of p. 32.

(1) האדם, see (13), (37) of previous section. "J employs sparingly proper names." Yet J names Adam, 4:25; Eve, 4:1, 3:20 (arbitrarily assigned to R); Cain and Abel (cf. in P 5:4); Cain's descendants, Seth, Enosh, Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth, Nimrod, and many others in ch. 10; Terah, Abram, Nahor, Sarai, Milcah, Iscah, Hagar, Keturah and her children, etc., etc.; and the sacred name Jehovah, while P has the common noun Elohim.

(2) ירע as a euphemism four times in J, twice in J<sub>1</sub>, three times in P. There is no difference in the case that affects the meaning of the word.

(3) יסף in the sense of *again* is referred to J or E, except in Lev. 26:18 P<sup>1</sup>.

(4) רעה *keep sheep*, (5) עבר האדמה *till the ground, dig wells* (used by J in but one narrative, 26:19,21,22,32), *water flocks*, are "frequent in J, but not found in P." It is to be presumed that he had heard of such things, and knew the proper words for them, but had no occasion to speak of them. This also applies to (9) רבין ,

(10) צעק (once in P), (12) כח , (14) אהל , (23) נחם .

(6) מנחה is used by J of three things, viz., the offering of Cain and Abel, 4:3,4,5; Jacob's present to Esau, 33:10; his present to the governor of Egypt, 43:11,15,25,26. P uses the word freely when he has occasion for it, Ex. 29:41, etc.

(7) שעה Gen. 4:4,5 J; Ex. 5:9 E; nowhere else in Hexateuch.

(8) חרה mostly referred to J or E. On Josh 7:1 Dillmann says, "This is a fragment from P as is shown by Josh. 22:20 P, only instead of 'ויהי קצף' he must have said, 'ויהי אף' which would suit the hypothesis better.

(10) צעק commonly referred to E; but how this is accomplished may be illustrated from Ex. 14:15, where a clause is cut out of a verse belonging to P solely and avowedly because it contains צעק .

(11) פצה occurs but once besides in J.

(13) ילד "to beget," for which P uses הוליד . ילד is limited to J only by critical

legerdemain. Gen. 22:23 is referred to J notwithstanding the allusion by P in 25:20, which makes it necessary to assume that P had stated the same thing in some other passage now lost; this also carries with it 22:20, whose allusion to 11:29 requires the latter to be torn from its connection and referred to J. In 25:3 יֵלֶךְ alternates with וַיֵּלֶךְ, which is made a criterion of P in ch. 10, cf. also 46:9 sqq.; Ex. 6:15 sqq.

Nos. 14-22 occur in J<sup>1</sup>, who is by the hypothesis a distinct writer from J, and cannot therefore be adduced in evidence of his diction. (18) הָאֵלֹהִים, (19) פָּצַע, (21) חֲבוּרָה do not occur in J at all. The same is probably true of (16) הוּא אֱבִי, since in 10:21 הוּא belongs to a different clause from אֱבִי; 11:29, 22:21 הוּא does

not occur, and the reference of 19:37,38 is doubtful; Kautzsch at least ascribes these verses to R. (15) כִּנּוֹר, (17) שֵׁם אֲחִיו, (22) חֶלֶל meaning *to be the first*, occur but once in J. (20) יָלַךְ (noun) with the exception of 44:20, occurs in but one narrative in J, 32:23; 33:1-14, which seems best accounted for by supposing that this word belonged to that story in its oral or written form, and is here accordingly retained.

(24) The only word under this number not before remarked upon is תְּשׁוּקָה, occurring but twice in the Hexateuch, Gen. 3:6; 4:7, and each time according to Wellhausen, Budde, Kuenen and Kittel by a different writer, p. 62.

### 3) SUBDIVISION OF THE DOCUMENTS.

It is a curious circumstance that, while Dillmann and Wellhausen agree that 4:1b-15 (or 16) J and vs. 1a,16(or 17)-24 J<sup>1</sup> must be from different writers, and that one of these wrote chs. 2, 3, they are at strife as to which it was. Dillmann adduces what he considers clear proofs from diction and style that chs. 2, 3 belong to J. Wellhausen and those who follow him in this particular set these aside without ceremony and attribute these chapters to J<sup>1</sup>. Dillmann, with some hesitation, it is true, identifies J<sup>1</sup> with E; others make them quite distinct. To these indications of the inconclusiveness of critical arguments in the view of the critics themselves add the intimation, p. 59, that it may be considered an open question "whether J<sup>1</sup> is to be taken as the original, J<sup>2</sup> being an interpolation; or J<sup>2</sup> is the real J, J<sup>1</sup> having been incorporated," that is to say, whether the sections of J<sup>1</sup> or those assigned to J<sup>2</sup> are by the same hand as those attributed to J in the rest of Genesis. If this is not the meaning, the remark would seem to be superfluous. That it was so intended appears to be implied p. 32 (1), where J<sup>2</sup> is apparently distinguished from J, although they are commonly identified. Such admissions leave one in doubt of the infallibility of the critical sense in some other cases.

The discovery of successive strata in each document severally, announced by Wellhausen, and in which he has been eagerly followed since, is simply a return to the principles and methods of the fragmentary hypothesis. Their adoption can only result in an indefinite disintegration of the documents and a destruction of the entire basis on which their existence is supposed to rest, as appears most plainly in the results already reached respecting the priestly legislation. It is the inevitable nemesis of the hypothesis reacting upon itself. The very principles and methods which are employed in dividing the Pentateuch into different documents, can be applied with like success and quite as much cogency in the division and subdivision of each of the documents to any assignable extent.

## 4) DUPLICATE STATEMENTS.

Dillmann thinks that the composite character of the Book of Genesis is shown more plainly in the duplicate mention of the birth of Seth and Enosh, 4:25, 26; 5:3-6, than anywhere else. Why should the same writer thus repeat himself?

The critics see in 4:25,26 the beginning of a genealogy by J, to which 5:29 also belonged. It is held, therefore, that J must have given the line of descent from Adam to Noah in full, parallel to that by P in ch.5; but that R, while omitting the greater portion as needless repetition, saw fit to retain these three verses because of the additional information which they convey. Ch. 5:29 was inserted from J in the body of P's genealogy, but 4:25,26 R saw fit to preserve distinct. Now it is difficult to see why the same motive, be it what it might, which determined R not to blend 4:25,26 with the corresponding verses of ch. 5, as he had done 5:29, might not be similarly influential with the original writer. Some reasons for such a separate statement naturally offer themselves.

1. One arises out of the original plan of the Book of Genesis and its division into successive sections, each in a manner complete in itself and introduced by its own special title, "these are the generations," etc. This division is unfortunately obscured to the common reader by the familiar division into chapters. The preceding section, 2:4-ch. 4, had recorded a constant descent from bad to worse, the sin of our first parents, their expulsion from paradise, the murder of Abel, Cain's descendants reaching in Lamech the climax of boastful and unrestrained violence. That the section might not be suffered to end in unrelieved gloom, a brighter outlook is added at the close, precisely as in 6:8. Seth is substituted for Abel whom Cain slew, and instead of piety perishing with murdered Abel it reaches a new development in the days of Enosh.

2. These closing verses are further necessary to the proper understanding of ch. 5. While the insertion of these statements in that chapter would have been confusing and would have marred its symmetry, it was important to set 5:3 in its true light in relation to 5:1,2, as is done by 4:25, and to indicate the character of the race of Seth in contrast with the ungodly race of Cain, as is done by 4:26.

The whole bears evidence of adaptation and careful thought, and is suggestive of one author, not the combination of separate compositions prepared with no reference to each other.

A further indication of the same sort, implying the original unity of these chapters, is their correspondence with the general plan of Genesis in respect to genealogies. Uniformly the divergent lines are first traced before proceeding with the principal line of descent leading to the chosen people. Ch. 10 the various nations of mankind sprung from the three sons of Noah, then 11:10 sqq. the line from Shem to Abram. Nahor's descendants 22:20 sqq., those of Keturah 25:1 sqq., and of Ishmael verses 12 sqq., before those of Isaac verses 19 sqq. Those of Esau 36:1 sqq. before those of Jacob 37:2 sqq. In like manner the

degenerate and God-forsaken race of Cain is traced 4:17 sqq. before proceeding with that of Seth ch. 5. Is this conformity with the constant plan of the book the accidental result of the junction of two documents of diverse character, independently prepared with no reference to each other?

#### IV. SECTION 3.—GEN. 6:1-9:29.

The divisive hypothesis is now getting into deeper waters, of which the narrative of the deluge is at once a symbol and an occasion. Hitherto it has had an ostensible ground for partition in distinct sections determined either by the alternation of divine names or by the change of subject or by both combined. Now this resource forsakes it, and it must venture on the open sea, destitute of chart or compass. And this is but a premonition of the reefs and shallows, cross-currents and whirlpools, fogs and storms, and every peril known to navigators, which must be encountered in its hazardous course. If the history of literature affords an ampler illustration of "confusion worse confounded" than the hopelessly inextricable medley in which the critics find themselves in their attempts to struggle through the three middle books of the Pentateuch, and that acquisition of doubtful value to themselves which they have recently annexed to form a Hexateuch, the Book of Joshua, it has never yet been discovered.

We are told, p. 39, that "this section contains two entirely distinct accounts of the deluge," and pp. 46 sqq., that these accounts differ irreconcilably in several respects. Let us inquire into the correctness of these statements.

##### 1. No Duplicate Account of the Deluge.

It is alleged, p. 46, that "the material is throughout duplicated." But this is clearly a mistake. The narrative contains no superfluous repetition. The idea that it does arises from confounding things which differ, or from overlooking reasons which naturally led in the plan of the writer to a re-statement in a different connection of certain particulars which, in an event so extraordinary, so graphically related and upon the details of which the writer dwells with such evident interest, is surely not surprising.

Apparently the most plausible instance meets us at the outset. Gen. 6:5-8 Jehovah sees the wickedness of men and resolves to destroy them all except Noah; whereupon follow verses 9-13, in which Elohim sees the wickedness of men and announces to Noah his purpose to destroy them. Is not here a clear case in which there is first a statement by J, then a repetition of the very same statement by P? Not at all; vs. 6,7 declare the divine purpose, verse 13 the announcement of this purpose to Noah, which is quite distinct and carries the narrative forward a step further. Observe also that in the scheme of the book a new section begins 6:9. In order to the completeness of this section it is introduced with a statement of the situation. The sons of Noah are named afresh,

6:10; cf. 5:32; but no one suspects a difference of writer on this account; see a like summary of previous statements for the same reason 25:19,20; so the wickedness of men in the sight of God is re-stated in a few words 6:11,12, as preliminary to the declaration of his purpose.

Elohim directs Noah to build an ark for the preservation of himself and every species of living things, which Noah does, 6:14-22. Jehovah then bids Noah to enter the ark, taking some of all living creatures with him; which Noah does, 7:1-5. These paragraphs plainly belong together, each incomplete without the other. By assigning the former to P and the latter to J, J is made to assume the existence of the ark, though he has said nothing of its being built; and P records the construction of the ark, but after it is finished God never tells him to enter it. The consequence is that the critics have no sooner sundered these paragraphs than, in order to restore the connection, they are straightway obliged to assume that J must have written something just like 6:14-22, and P something just like 7:1-5, only R did not think proper to preserve it. He made up his account with a paragraph from P and another from J, which though written quite independently, dovetail precisely as if written continuously.

Ch. 7:7-9 records Noah's entry into the ark with his family and some of all living things; then in vs. 13-16 their entry into the ark is mentioned again. The critics say that the same identical thing is here stated first by J, then by P. But in assigning vs. 7-9 to J they violate their own criteria in almost every particular. "Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him" (not "all his house" as 7:1), רמש "creeping," "two and two" (no mention of "seven and seven" as 7:2), "male and female," and "Elohim" are all declared to be marks of P. It is a sheer subterfuge to say with Dillmann that R has here freely modified the text "in order to compose the differences as far as possible." Why he should be concerned just here to alter forms of expression which he retains without change elsewhere, or to reconcile differences which no pains are taken to remove in other places, does not appear. And this is particularly insupposable in the present instance; for the only reason why R can be imagined to have used the statements of both documents, instead of only one, as in other cases, is that he might preserve what was peculiar in each. And yet we are told that he has himself neutralized the very end he had in view by conforming one to the other. The fact is that there is no indication of two documents or of a duplicate narrative here at all, any more than there is in the twofold statement of the time of the flood 7:6,11, where no one suspects a difference of writers. Precisely as the date of the flood is first given generally, the year only being named, and then more specifically by the month and the day, so the entry into the ark is first stated in general terms, and then "the selfsame day" on which it took place is accurately fixed. And if the criteria of the critics are of any worth, there was but one writer in the case.



From 7:11 to 8:20 the name Jehovah occurs but once, viz., 7:16b, which is for this reason held to belong to J. With this sole exception there is not throughout the passage just indicated a word or a phrase that is elsewhere claimed as characteristic of J,\* and the assigning of any portion of it to that document is purely arbitrary and without justification on the ground of diction, style, theology or anything else. Hupfeld succeeded in picking out a clause here and a clause there from the sentences to which they belonged, and thus made a shift to preserve the continuity of J. But he had no warrant for so doing except, as Delitzsch fitly phrases it, "the omnipotence resident in the ink of a German scholar."

Ch. 7:12 is sundered from its connection and given to J because of its correspondence with v. 4. Yet **גשם** *rain*, v. 12, is quite different from **מטר**, v. 4, and nowhere occurs in J, though rain is repeatedly mentioned. It is found but once in the Hexateuch, Lev. 26:4, about whose authorship the critics are not agreed. The number "forty" surely is not peculiar to J. P is not precluded from saying that it rained forty days and nights, because J had said that it would do so, whether this be supposed to be the historical fact or merely the current belief. P speaks elsewhere of periods of forty days and forty years, Lev. 12:2,4; Num. 13:25; 14:34. Just here the perplexity of the critics in respect to 7:17a is instructive. "The flood was forty days upon the earth" is given entire by Dillmann to J, by Kuenen to R, and with the exception of the words "forty days," by Kautzsch and Socin to P; also by Hupfeld to P without exception, only the "forty days" must be understood differently from J in 7:4. All is with the design of bringing J and P into conflict regarding the duration of the flood; so that is effected, they are not particular about the mode of accomplishing it.

The attempt to set v. 12 in contrast with v. 11b, as though something belonging to a different order of things was intended, cannot be called successful. The opening of the windows of heaven cannot by possibility suggest anything but deluging rains, even to those who would fasten upon the sacred writer the conception of a supernal ocean and literal flood-gates in the sky, and this conclusion is further rendered necessary by the Hebrew phrase, v. 12. The Waw Consec. future indicates that the rain was not a separate and independent thing, but the sequence of opening the windows of heaven.

For similar reasons it is equally arbitrary and unwarranted to sunder the first two clauses of 8:2 from the last clause, assigning the former to P and the latter to J.

\* The only plausible instance that can be adduced is 7:22, "in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life," compared with 2:7 J, where, however, the reference is to man alone and the phrase is "breath of life." It equally stands in relation to 6:17 and 7:15 P, where the reference is to the lower animals as well, and the phrase is "spirit of life"; a relation which the critics acknowledge, when they seek to expunge **רוח** *spirit* from 7:22 by ascribing it to R. **קין** 7:23, which occurs once in J 7:4, once in D, Deut. 11:6, and nowhere else in the Bible, is not to the point. Nor is **כחיה** 7:23, which besides 6:7 and 7:4 is to be found only Ex. 32:32,33, in J, and occurs in P, Num. 5:23. Nor **חלון** 8:6, which is found besides in the Hexateuch only in Gen. 26:8 J, and Josh. 2:15,18,21, where the critics are uncertain whether it belongs to J or E.

A like severance is made of clauses from their connection in respect to the increase of the waters, 7:17<sup>b</sup>, the perishing of all terrestrial life, 7:22,23, the diminution of the waters, 8:3<sup>a</sup>, and the drying of the ground, 8:13<sup>b</sup>. The plea in each case is that there are parallel statements conveying substantially the same thought, which cannot be referred to a single writer, who would not express himself so pleonastically. They must accordingly be regarded as indicating distinct documents. But

1. If R felt it important to emphasize the momentous character of the successive stages of the flood by these repeated statements, why may not the original writer have dwelt upon them in like manner for a similar reason?

2. After the partition is made, there still remain repetitions in each document severally, so that if this is a valid ground for division, the partition should be carried further still. The increase of the waters is stated four times with some variations in form and in the accompanying circumstances, 7:17-20; the death of all that lived upon the earth, three times, vs. 21-23; the subsidence of the waters, four times, 8:1,3,5; the drying of the surface of the ground, three times, vs. 13,14. The writer in each case recurs to the same thing again and again to note its advance, or to give expression to his sense of its extraordinary character.

3. Like repetitions abound in other cases in which no one imagines that they are traceable to a diversity of documents; thus to draw illustrations only from the narrative of the flood, see 6:11,12; 7:14-16\*; 5:32, 6:10, 10:1; 9:9,11; 9:12-17.

The paragraph relating to Noah's sending out the birds, 8:6-12, is quite devoid of any critical marks allying it to one or other of the documents, as is apparent from the history of its treatment. From Astruc and Eichhorn to the supplementary critics Tuch and Knobel, it was almost uniformly assigned to P. Stähelin is uncertain about it. Reuss regards it as the sole surviving remnant of a third account of the flood distinct from the other two. Hupfeld gives 8:7, the raven, to J and vs. 8-12, the dove, to P. Friedreich Delitzsch, on the other hand, gives the raven to P and the dove to J. Kayser, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Dillmann, and others, assign the whole to J, in which they were preceded by the eccentric Ilgen. The motive which at present inclines the majority to J appears to be twofold. Such a graphic incident is thought to befit the more "picturesque" narrator, and this is the most striking parallel with the cuneiform tablets, with which J is held to stand in the closer relation. Both an argument and an inference are supplied from these two points of view of a somewhat circular nature. It is assigned to J because he is picturesque and allied to the tablets; and being so assigned proves him to be picturesque and allied to the tablets. One cannot but feel that, *mutatis mutandis*, he might with equal ease have been called "rigid

---

\* Dillmann lays bare the secret of the whole matter, when he says on Gen. 7:16: "It is as though the author, moved by the momentous character of the day, could not do enough to satisfy himself in the detailed portraiture of the transaction."

and stereotyped" on account of his "regular formulas" and "repetition" of like phrases, thus: "and he sent forth the raven," v. 7; "and he sent forth the dove," v. 8; "and he stayed yet other seven days and sent forth the dove," vs. 10,12; "waters were abated from off the face of the ground," vs. 8,11, cf. v. 9; "to him into the ark," v. 9 *bis*; "going and returning" in Hebrew vs. 3,7, cf. v. 5.

The direction to leave the ark and the actual going forth from it, 8:15-19, are from P. J makes no mention of either. It is assumed that he must have recorded both, but R thought P's statement sufficient and hence did not preserve that of J along with it. This seems plausible. But why then was it worth while to retain both accounts of the entry into the ark, even while modifying them into almost precise conformity with one another? Is it not plain here again that the repetition in the former instance was not the inconsiderate copying of the same statement from two distinct sources, but was with the view of emphasizing the exactness with which the flood came upon the very day of the entry into the ark? There was no such emphasis connected with the moment of leaving it, and we find no repetition.

Noah's sacrifice, 8:20-22 J, and God's covenant with him, 9:1-17 P, are not parallel accounts of the same transaction, as the critics claim, but the former is preliminary to the latter. First comes the offering of the sacrifice, Jehovah's acceptance of it and his purpose not to destroy the earth again for the sin of man. This purpose is then communicated to Noah in the form of a blessing and a covenant with an instituted sign.

The examination of the narrative of the flood thus shows that so far from everything being duplicated, nothing is duplicated from first to last except the entry into the ark, and that for a special reason not suggestive of two documents, but excluding them. Moreover, when all has been assigned to J, that can with any reason be given him, this does not yield a continuous parallel record of the entire transaction. With the exception of a single clause in 7:16, it is limited to two brief paragraphs at the beginning, 6:1-8; 7:1-5, and one at the end, 8:20-22. The documentary character of J finds no support here. If there were two writers, it would seem as though J could only have made some short supplementary additions to the larger and fuller narrative of P.

But here the documentary critics retort that the supplementary hypothesis will not account for the twofold statement of the entry into the ark. They have a Redactor ready at hand who might have copied the same thing into his narrative from two different sources, and in copying might have assimilated one to the other, senseless as such a proceeding would be; but who would ever undertake to supplement a treatise that he was editing, by adding of his own motion what was already there, and that in almost identical terms, and in doing so adopt the words and phrases of the book itself instead of those which he was accustomed to employ

in every other addition made by him? Each class of critics seems to be in the right as against the other; and themselves being judges, neither form of the hypothesis is free from difficulties in this portion of Genesis.

## 2. No Discrepancies.

Ch. 6:1-4 is said (p. 60) to be in conflict with all that follows in two respects, (1) in limiting human life thenceforth to 120 years, (2) in ignoring the flood; the Nephilim are here spoken of, and as the Nephilim were still in existence Num. 13:33, there could in the view of the author of this passage have been no deluge in which all mankind perished with the exception of a single family. It is accordingly claimed that these verses are not properly a part of J, but have been introduced into it from J<sup>1</sup>, an older document which knows nothing of a deluge. They are quite foreign to the context in which they are found, and contain a mythical account of the origin of the Nephilim, a gigantic race among the Canaanites, who are here represented as having sprung from the intermarriage of angels with the daughters of men. Nothing could well be more baseless and chimerical.

1. It is observable that the argument of diversity is not here rested in any measure upon differences of diction and style. Budde (*Biblische Urgeschichte*, p. 6) points out in detail the exact conformity of 6:1,2 to the language of J elsewhere.

2. The author or compiler of Genesis certainly could not intentionally have so stultified himself, as this view of the passage supposes, by inserting that as introductory to the narrative of the flood which by its very terms precludes its existence. Could he so grossly have mistaken its meaning? or is it not possible that modern critics may put a wrong interpretation on these isolated verses?

3. This most extraordinary conclusion is built on very slender premises. Its sole support is the application of the same term, "Nephilim," to antediluvians and to Canaanites. The word is obscure in its meaning and its derivation. The LXX. and Jerome translate it "giants." It is more probably an appellative than a gentile noun. It does not occur again in the narrative of the conquest, but only in the report of the spies, whose excited imagination could best express their impression of these men of great stature and powerful frames by saying that they were the old giants revived; but with no more thought of denying the fact of the deluge than one who might call an intense old foggy an antediluvian. Or if Nephilim was an actual national name, is sameness of name a sure argument of identity? May we not call the American aborigines Indians without involving ourselves in the old error of Columbus? or speak of Trojans in the State of New York without discrediting the fall of ancient Troy? or have the exploits of Jack the giant-killer anything to do with the giants of the ancient Greek mythology?

4. Whatever interpretation be put upon doubtful expressions in Gen. 6:3, it plainly intimates the divine purpose to inflict some penalty affecting the life of the whole human race. "His days shall be 120 years," if spoken of the generation then living would mean that they should not survive that limit; if of successive generations of men, that this should henceforth be the term of human life. The former is demanded by the context. The latter is preferred by critics whose uniform usage is to interpret at variance with the context, if possible. It is here absolutely without support. There is no suggestion anywhere that the duration of human life was ever fixed at 120 years. It is contradicted by all that is narrated of the ages of the patriarchs.\*

The alleged discrepancy in regard to the duration of the deluge, p. 46, as though J made it 60 or 100 days and P a year, is a pure figment.

1. All the seeming basis for this misrepresentation has been destroyed by the demonstration already given that there are not two distinct accounts of the deluge.

2. But even allowing the arbitrary and indefensible partition made by the critics, their inference does not follow. The trick is so transparent that it should impose upon no one. It is simply parading a part as though it were the whole. "At the end of forty days Noah opened the window of the ark," 8:6. Forty days from what? The critics are in doubt, p. 47, note, whether to reckon from the day that the forty days' rain began or that it ended. What then is to be thought of the intelligence of R in compiling this narrative? As this verse stands, it is not possible to reckon otherwise than from the 1st day of the 10th month, 8:5. Adding to this the three periods of seven days, it appears that the dove was sent out for the last time on the 1st day of the 12th month. After another month Noah removes the covering of the ark. And in a month and twenty-seven days more he leaves the ark entirely. All is thus in perfect harmony.

3. The inference of the critics is besides quite unfounded upon their own principles. By their own concession J is not complete. His genealogy from Adam to Noah is only preserved in part. His account of building the ark and of Noah's leaving it have been omitted, R not judging it necessary to repeat from J what he had already inserted from P. Whence then this sudden confidence that no numbers originally in J have been omitted, notwithstanding the fact that such an assumption gives to his statements a meaning that they cannot now have, sets them in opposition to otherwise uncontradicted statements of P, and convicts R of incapacity or worse?

---

\* The question whether the sons of God in 6:2,4 were angels (p. 49) has nothing to do with the critical partition of the passage and cannot here be discussed. No one need be surprised at any conceit of a certain class of interpreters. It is not strange that Josephus should have imported into this passage ideas borrowed from the Greek mythology. But it is to my mind utterly incomprehensible how judicious, not to say reverent, interpreters, could for one moment countenance an opinion so utterly without warrant or analogy in any part of Scripture, so unmeaning and so baseless.

The general direction, 6:19 P, to take a pair of each kind of animals, is made more specific when the time arrives to enter the ark, clean beasts by sevens, the unclean by twos, 7:2 J. But J also relapses into the general form of statement, 7:9; or if the critics prefer, R does so, which amounts to the same thing, as by the hypothesis he had J's previous statement before him. There is no more discrepancy here than between 7:6 and 11.

Ch. 7:10 the flood came seven days not after Noah entered the ark, but after the announcement, 7:1-4; so there is no conflict with 7:13.

The differences alleged, p. 48, "as to the form of the ark" and "the general conception of the flood" are foisted upon the text, not found in it.

We find on p. 61 a precious piece of historical and literary criticism in relation to 9:20-27. An ancient prophecy, in which the names of Shem, Japheth and Canaan appear, is there recorded, together with the circumstances under which it was delivered. The critics think the circumstances improbable; therefore they are untrue. Noah is here "a husbandman, a rôle quite distinct from that of a navigator," which he sustains elsewhere; as if he should have been cultivating the soil during the flood, or should continue to sail about in the ark after the flood was over. They can see no reason why sentence should have been pronounced upon Canaan for the shameful deed of his father; therefore there was no reason; therefore it was not done. As though it were not the keenest of inflictions upon a father to be punished in his child; and as though the law of heredity, the propagation of character and the perpetuation of the evil consequences of transgression generation after generation were not among the most patent and familiar facts, of which the beastliness of the Canaanites and their merited doom afford a signal illustration. And now, if they may change the text of the narrative on the pretext of conforming it with the prophecy, and so make Shem, Japheth and Canaan the three sons of Noah, they can thus bring it into conflict with every other statement in the history; therefore this has been extracted from a document J<sup>1</sup> at variance with both J and P. Or if they may reverse the process, and insert Ham instead of Canaan in the prophecy, they can show that it was not fulfilled. Or if they may put a belittling interpretation upon the prophecy, they can restrict it to a "narrow" range. By this time they have shown that something is absurd. They think that it is this venerable prophecy, whose profound and far-reaching meaning, whose appropriateness in a book intended for Israel about to enter on the conquest of Canaan, and whose exact fulfillment have been universally recognized. Most persons will think that the absurdity is in their treatment of the passage.

## 3. The Critical Partition.

## 1) THE LANGUAGE OF P.

Words already considered need not be repeated here.

6:9, (2) תמים of character, only once beside, viz., 17:1 P (often in ritual law of animal "without blemish"); in E, Josh. 24:14; cognate word תם in J, Gen. 25:27. (3) בדרתי, cf. בדרר, Gen. 7:1 J, nowhere else in Hex. with prep. ב; plur. in P to denote perpetuity of covenant with Noah, Gen. 9:12; circumcision, 17:12, and institutions in ritual law. (4) Walk with God ("free and confidential" intercourse, such as, p. 30, is ascribed to J in contrast with P), only beside 5:22,24 P; elsewhere "walk before God," 17:1 P; 24:40 J; 48:15 E.

6:11,12, (2) כל בשר only in flood and legislation. (3) שחת used by P, 6:13, in allusion to v. 12, also repeatedly in J: מחה in J, but also in P, Num. 5:23.

6:14,15, (1) גפר and (2) כפר only here; (3) קימה in Hex. only here and in description of articles in tabernacle.

6:16 (1) צהר only here in this sense; חלון, 8:8, assigned to J without reason.

6:17, ואני הנני, but twice besides in Hex., 9:9; Ex. 14:17; אנכי also repeatedly in J; אנכי, 7:4 J, but also 28:4 P. (2) מי מכול, Gen. 7:7 J; 9:11 P. (6) גוע in flood, death of patriarchs, and a few other cases; mostly with מות to make the statement more full and emphatic. Num. 20:3b is assigned to P on the ground of גוע alone, though vs. 3a,4,5 are from E. No record of a death in all the Hex. is assigned to J, except Gen. 11:28; 38:12; Ex. 2:23. מות is used alike by P, J and E.

6:18, (1) הקים ברית, also in J, Lev. 26:9 (so Dillmann), only of God's covenant with Noah, 9:9,11,17, and the patriarchs, 17:7,19,21; Ex. 6:4, with special reference to their perpetuity. כרת ברית, the ordinary phrase for contracting a covenant, suggestive of accompanying sacrificial rites, in all other covenants whether between men, Gen. 21:27,32, or of God with men, Ex. 24:8; 34:27; once only of God's covenant with Abram, Gen. 15:18, with allusion to the formalities, vs. 9:10. In Deut., the constantly of God's covenant then made with Israel, 4:23; 5:2,3, etc.; הקים of that with their fathers, 8:18; 29:11-13. In Ezek. 16:60,82

הקים of God's ancient and irrevocable covenant with Israel, cf. 2 Kgs. 23:3,24. נתן ברית of a covenant divinely granted, Gen. 9:12; 17:2; Num. 25:12. (2) the expression "thou and thy sons," etc. So in 7:7 J, or by an evasion referred to R.

6:22, (2) עשה כן emphatic formula, also Ex. 7:6, besides only in ritual law; once Ex. 12:28 in J connection though referred arbitrarily to P. (3) צוה אתו twice besides in P, 7:16; 21:4; in J, Ex. 34:4; צוהו twice in J, Gen. 7:5; Ex. 4:28; in P, Num. 20:9.

7:6, (1) the calculation, so in J connection, arbitrarily referred to P, 8:13; 25:20,26; 47:28, so also in E, Gen. 50:26; Josh. 24:29.

7:11, ארבות, 8:2, nowhere else in Hex.

7:13-16a, (1) עצם self-same Deut. 32:48 P, once in JE connection, Josh. 10:27, arbitrarily referred to Rd; in Hex. besides only in ritual contexts. (2) חיה wild beast, so J 2:20; also including domestic animals, P 1:30; 9:2,5; J 2:19.

7:18-21, (1) גבר here four times in P; in J, 49:26; E, Ex. 17:11; nowhere else in Hex.; all five of its derivatives in J or E. (2) מאר מאר, also in J, 30:43. (3) Is fifteen cubits P more of a "calculation" than seven days and forty days, J 7:4? see also J Gen. 38:24; Num. 14:33; 32:13. (7) ב prep., used distributively, so J, Ex. 10:15 (Wellhausen).

8:1,2a,3b-5. (3) שכן, Num. 17:20 P, nowhere else in Hex. (7) Calculations. Hupfeld's conjecture, *Quellen d. Gen.*, p. 16, note, that 8:4 belongs to J and only the date to P is instructive as to critical methods.

8:13a,14-19, (12) למשפחתיהם, with this form of suf. here only; למשפחתם arbitrarily referred to P, though the preceding genealogy is given to J, 10:20,31; למשפחתיו (suf. collective) in J, Num. 11:10.

9:1-3, (1) יורכך also in J, Gen. 30:30; 32:30; 39:5, etc. (4) מורא in Hex. only here and four times in Deut. (5) חת nowhere else in Hex. החה, Gen. 35:5, insertion by R from E. (8) ייק עשב, 1:30 P; ייק besides in Hex. only Ex. 10:15 (E, Dill., J, Well.), Num. 22:4 J.

9:4-7, (1) legal phraseology, "require blood," in Hex. besides only Gen. 42:22 E; the prohibition of eating blood is in the writer's mind based upon sacrificial expiation, Lev. 17:10-14, and proves that in his view sacrifice already

existed, contrary to the repeated allegation, p. 38 (2), p. 50 (3), etc.

9:8-11, (4) You and your seed, also in J, 26:3; 28:13.

## 2) THE LANGUAGE OF J.

6:1-4. If this is from J<sub>1</sub>, it cannot be cited to show the diction of J. (3) בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים nowhere else in Hex. (3) טוֹב in a physical sense, so in P, 1:4,12; Lev. 27:10 sqq.; Num. 36:6. (4) דִּין only here. (5) נְפִלִים besides only Num. 13:33 E; not in J at all. (6) גְּבוּר only once in J, 10:8.

6:5-8, (9) רַק and (9) מִצָּא חֵן happen not to occur in P. (7) אֶל-לְבֹ in Hex. besides only 8:21. Alleged insertions by R are simply confessions that the facts do not correspond with the hypothesis.

7:1-5, (4) טָהוֹר, a technical word of ritual law, only in the narrative of the flood, 7:2,8, 8:20 (the verb once in E, 35:2), before the Mosaic period; there is no proof that it would have been esteemed an anachronism by P. (5) אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ (of animals) only 7:2 bis, but in vs. 3,9 וְנִקְבְּהָ זָכָר arbitrarily assigned to R. J has זָכָר, Ex. 13:12,15, cf. also 34:23, of which נִקְבָּה is the only correlative term. P not only uses אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ of persons, Ex. 35:29, but אִשָּׁה even of inanimate objects, as curtains, Ex. 26:3,5,6. (6) לִימִים Dill. adduces לְמַחֵר Ex. 8:19 J as a parallel use of ל.

8:2b,3a, (2) שׁוּב arbitrarily referred to J; in P, Lev. 14:39, etc.

8:6-12,13b, (2) קָלָל nowhere else in this sense; in P, Lev. 24:11 sqq.; חָסַר in P, Gen. 8:5; Ex. 16:18; in J, Gen. 18:28, nowhere else in Hex. except three times in Deut. (4) מְנוּחַ and חוּל not elsewhere in Hex. (6) מִכְסָּה in P, Ex. 26:14, etc., the covering does not exclude a door in the side.

8:20-22, (1) מְנוּחַ and (3) עֵלָה are always associated with יְהוָה, not with אֱלֹהִים, unless defined as Gen. 22:1 sqq., הָאֱלֹהִים, and 46:1, "the God of his father Isaac." רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ, a technical expression of the ritual law (P), is here used by J. (12) כָּל-חֵי only here in J (3:20 is referred to R); but also in P, 6:19, differing only in the generic article. (13) חָרָף, קִיץ, קָר only here in Hex. (14) חָם in Hex. besides only 18:1.

9:18-21, (2) נִפְצָה כָּל הָאָרֶץ, for which P is said to have נִפְרְדוּ הַגּוֹיִם בָּאָרֶץ, but Dillmann admits that they have not precisely the same sense. (6) שָׁכַר here in J<sub>1</sub>, in Hex. besides only 43:34; cognate noun in P, Lev. 10:9; Num. 6:3.

9:22-27, (1) בְּחוּץ here in J<sub>1</sub>, only once in J, 24:31; P has the same noun without a prep. חוּץ Lev. 18:9, or with a different prep., מִחוּץ, Gen. 6:14, etc. (2) שְׁמֵלָה not in P. (3) אַחֲרֵיכֵן here in J<sub>1</sub>; nowhere else in Hex.

## V. SECTION 4.—GEN. 10:1-12:5.

### 1. No Discrepancies.

That Havilah and Sheba occur both (10:7) among the descendants of Ham and (vs. 28,29) of Shem is readily explained either as suggested, p. 55 (3), there may have been two tribes of each name, or the tribes may have been of mixed origin, partly of one race, partly of another; cf. Dedan, 10:7, 25:3; Lud, 10:13,22; Uz, 10:23, 22:21, 36:28; Asshur, 10:22, was descended from Shem; Asshurim, 25:3, from Abraham by Keturah. It is quite incredible that in the intention of the author, this obscure Arabian tribe is to be identified with the famous Assyrian empire.

"The difficulty in passing from ch. 10 to ch. 11," p. 56 (6), is purely fanciful. Before parting finally with the three sons of Noah the writer traces their descend-



ants in the different nations of mankind with their various languages, ch. 10. He then resumes the thread of his history in ch. 11, and explains how the first impulse was given to the dispersion of men and the division of languages. It is precisely as any historian would do who is not a mere annalist.

There is not the slightest ground in the text for the representation (p. 56) that "vast multitudes" were engaged in building the tower and that Jehovah was "alarmed" in consequence, or that there were only "twenty families." "Cush begat Nimrod," 10:8; but this need not indicate a single generation any more than when Noah's grandson Canaan begat several tribes, vs. 15-18, or when (Mt. 1:1) Jesus Christ is called the son of David and David the son of Abraham. How this narrative conflicts with the account of the deluge, it is impossible to see.

## 2. The Critical Partition.

The suspicion was early expressed that the episode respecting Nimrod (vs. 8-12) did not belong originally to ch. 10, for no reason apparently but its parenthetic character. Critics were generally agreed that the rest of the chapter was a unit; and as there was no apparent ground for attaching it to one document rather than the other, it was by some referred to P, and by others to J. Wellhausen compromised the matter by assuming that בְּנֵי the sons of, vs. 2-4, etc., was a sign of P, and יָלַד, vs. 8, 13, 15, etc., of J, and divided the chapter on that basis, in spite of the fact that these are both combined in 25:3, 4, which is confessedly from a single source.

### 1) THE LANGUAGE OF P.

Words before explained will not be repeated.

וַיִּזְרֹא 10:1, as J 4:18; יָלַד 4:26, 10:21 J, as P 35:26, 36:5 (so Dill.), 46:22, 27; בְּנוֹיָהֶם only in this chapter. פָּרַד 10:5, but J 18:14; 25:23; 30:40; פָּלַג alleged to be its equivalent in J 10:25, found only here in Hex. אָיִם only here in Hex. אֹר כְּשֵׁרִים "not found in J" simply because it is cut out of a J context, 11:28; 15:7, and assigned to R. רָבוּשׁ clause cut out of E

context, 31:18, and assigned to P on account of this word, in 14:11, 12, 16, 21 in E (Dill.); מִקְנֵה said to be its equivalent in JE is found in P, 34:5, 23; 36:6, 7; 46:6. The words and phrases of the genealogy, 11:10-26, show it to be the continuation of that in ch. 5, but contain nothing to connect it with P more than J.

### 2) THE LANGUAGE OF J.

נָבִיר but three times in Gen., 10:8 J, v. 9 R, 6:4 J, besides in Hex. only D and Rd. נָם הוּא besides only 4:4, 26; 27:31 in all the Hex. מִיֹּשֵׁב in J only here, in precisely the same sense 36:43 P. שָׁפַד only here in Hex. in this sense; in P Ex. 6:12, 30. דְּבָרִים in P 34:18. לִשְׁנָן only ch. 10 in this sense in Hex.; in J Ex. 4:10; 11:7. מִקְדָּם in P Num. 34:11. בִּקְעָה here in J, nowhere in J. שָׁנַעַר once in J, twice in J. אִישׁ אֶל-רֵעֵהוּ but once in J 43:33, and without אֶל 15:10; 31:49. It does not chance to occur

in P, though רֵעֵהוּ does, Josh. 20:5. "P uses אִישׁ אֶל-אֶחָיו or אִישׁ אִישׁ"; but אִישׁ אִישׁ is restricted to legal sections and cannot therefore be expected in J, אִישׁ אֶחָיו in J Gen. 26:31; Ex. 16:15; Lev. 26:37 and perhaps Num. 14:4. יָהֵב here in J; in J only 38:16; 47:15, 16; Deut. 32:3. לִבְנָה (verb), לָבֵן, חָמֵר and מִגְדָּל nowhere in J according to Dillmann; לִבְנָה and חָמֵר in a verse of P, Ex. 1:14, but arbitrarily cut out and attributed to R. יָרַד does not happen to be used of God in P, but is implied in the

cloud and glory resting upon Sinai, Ex. 24:16, 17, and the tabernacle, 40:34 sqq., as well as in God's *going up* from Abraham, 17:22. "P makes God *appear*," so does J, Gen. 12:7; 17:1; 18:1, etc. **הָאֵלֹהִים** here in J, only once in J, Deut. 32:8. **אֵלֹהִים** nowhere in J. **יְהוָה** in 11:28 be-

longs to P (so Dill., Well.) and has precisely the same sense as in 12:1. **אֱלֹהִים** in P 36:9 (Dill.), **שֵׁם** P 36:39, see also vs. 10, 40. **עֲקָרָה** in P 11:30 (Dill. and Well.). **וְלֹד** only here. **נָדַל** in P, Num. 6:5.

We have now examined in detail every word and phrase alleged as characteristic of P or J, and are certainly justified in saying that the argument of diversity from this source has been immensely exaggerated. The great body of what is adduced is utterly irrelevant. The words occur so rarely as to be no criterion of a writer's ordinary diction, or they occur in the other document as well, or, if not, it is because there was no occasion for their employment. And when synonyms occur, they are used discriminately, as determined by the shade of meaning intended and not by the accidental habit of different writers. Such facts are of no significance whatever as respects the question of the existence of distinct documents. And if the long lists of words which we have scrutinized be purged of whatever is thus most satisfactorily explained, the residuum will be very small indeed, and scarcely worth considering but for an associated fact into which we now proceed to inquire, viz.,

#### The Alternation of Divine Names.

This is the starting-point from which the modern hypothesis of separable documents took its rise; and its concurrence with other criteria, which taken by themselves would be of small account, lends it whatever plausibility it possesses. The occurrence of Elohim and Jehovah in alternate sections in the first few chapters of Genesis is certainly very remarkable and plainly not accidental. There are some indications, though less distinct, of a like alternation in later chapters. But after Ex. ch. 3 or ch. 6 the name Jehovah comes into established predominance, and sections in which Elohim recurs with any marked frequency (such as Ex. 13:17-19; 18:1-7, 12-27) are thenceforth extremely rare. It is quite natural, accordingly, to inquire whether these chapters, which are to some extent a turning-point in the use of these names, may not supply a key to what is peculiar in their antecedent employment.

The critics interpret Ex. 6:3 to mean that the name Jehovah was then first revealed to Moses, p. 31 (5), and had not been in use in the time of the patriarchs. They hence regard all prior sections containing the name Jehovah as in conflict with this statement, p. 36 (7. b), especially as Jehovah is used not only in the language of the writer himself but when he is reporting the words of those who lived long before Moses' time. Such sections, it is said, imply a different belief as to the origin and use of this sacred name, and must, therefore, be attributed to another writer, who held that it was known from the earliest periods and who has recorded his idea upon that subject, Gen. 4:26, p. 37 (9.c). But

1. It is plain that the Redactor did not so understand Ex. 6:3. After recording the history of the patriarchs, in which free use is made of the name Jehovah, he is here supposed to introduce the statement from the mouth of God himself that they had never heard this name, and thus to have stultified himself completely.

2. It is equally plain that it could not have been so intended. This passage finds its explanation in the repeated statement that Israel (Ex. 6:7; 10:2; 16:12; 29:46), the Egyptians (7:5; 14:4,18) and Pharaoh (7:17; 8:6,18; 9:14,29; cf. 5:2) should know that he was Jehovah; not that they should be told that this was his name, but that they should witness the manifestation of those attributes which the name denoted. That he was not so known by the patriarchs can only mean, therefore, that while tokens of his almighty power had been vouchsafed to them, no such disclosure had been made of the perfections indicated by his name Jehovah as was now to be granted to their descendants.

3. The uniform usage of Scripture proves the same thing. A true apprehension of the divine perfections and not a mere acquaintance with the word Jehovah is the constant meaning of the phrase "to know the name of Jehovah," 1 Kgs. 8:43; Ps. 9:11; 91:14; Isa. 52:6; 64:1; Jer. 16:21; Ezek. 39:6,7.

It is important to observe here precisely what these arguments prove, viz. that Ex. 6:3 was not written with an antiquarian interest or from an antiquarian point of view. It does not concern itself about the history of the word Jehovah and cannot with any fairness be regarded as affirming or denying anything about it. Its sole design is to declare that Jehovah was about to manifest himself in the character represented by this name as he had not done to the patriarchs. Since, then, the writer did not intend to assert that the word was unknown to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, there is no reason why in relating their history he might not consistently introduce this word in language uttered by them or addressed to them.

Neither, it should also be observed, was the patriarchal history written in the spirit of a verbal antiquary, so as to make a point of rigorously abstaining from employing any word not then in current use. The God of the patriarchs was the very same as Jehovah, and the writer might as properly use the dialect of his own time in speaking of him, as in reporting the language of the antediluvians, without thereby warranting the inference that he supposed Hebrew to have been at that period a current form of speech.

Whether the name Jehovah was ante-Mosaic is a legitimate subject of inquiry. But it is not answered categorically in the negative by Ex. 6:3, nor inferentially in the affirmative by the use of this word in the patriarchal history. That question lay out of the plane of the writer's thoughts in the one place as well as in the other, and no express utterance is made regarding it. Much less have contradictory answers been given to it. The inconsistency which the critics

affirm, does not exist. There is consequently no difficulty from this source in supposing that the author of Ex. 6:3 may likewise have penned the Jehovist sections in Genesis.

If we may take a suggestion from Ex. 6:3, it would be that different names of God have each their distinct and proper signification. And this inherent signification of the terms must be taken into the account, if any successful attempt is to be made to explain their usage. It is not here pretended that this principle will solve the entire problem of the employment of the divine names in Genesis. Limiting considerations and additional elements, which need not here be anticipated, will be found to enter into it hereafter. It is sufficient now to show from the passage at present under consideration, that the mechanical and superficial solution of two blended documents offered by the critics, does not really cover the case.

Gen. 4:26 is understood by the critics to affirm that in the belief of J the name Jehovah first came into use in the days of Enosh, the son of Seth, p. 37 (9. c). This accords very well with Eve's use of Elohim, 4:25, at the birth of Seth and in conversation with the serpent, 3:1-5, but not with her mention of Jehovah, 4:1, at the birth of Cain. Reuss says that the writer here contradicts himself. Dillmann can only evade the difficulty by a transposition of the text. All which simply proves that their interpretation of 4:26 is false. It fixes the origin not of the word Jehovah, but of the formal invocation of God, the institution of public worship.

The exceptional introduction of Elohim in chs. 2:4-4:26, a section mainly characterized by Jehovah, shows that these names are used discriminately within the same document. Elohim is substituted for Jehovah in the conversation with the serpent, 3:1-5, as elsewhere in language used by aliens or addressed to them, Gen. chs. 20, 21:22, 23. At first sight it seems strange that Cain should be accepted, 4:1, as a gift from Jehovah, and Seth, 4:25, from Elohim; but in the latter passage the contrast is between man and God, see Gesen. Lex., אֱלֹהִים, B. 1. Cain slew Abel, but God bestowed another in his stead.

A like discrimination in the use of the divine names is obvious as between this section as a whole and the preceding Elohim section, 1:1-2:3; God working in nature and in the world at large is Elohim. True, the creative act may be ascribed to Jehovah, Ex. 20:11, when the thought to be conveyed is that Israel's God, who brought him out of the land of Egypt, was the creator of the world; but when the announcement to be made simply is that the world had a divine creator, Elohim is the proper term and is hence used in ch. 1 and to the end of the first section. Jehovah is distinctively the God of revelation and of redemption; hence in the succeeding section, where God's grace to man is the prominent thought, his care and favor bestowed upon him in his original estate, the primal promise of mercy after the fall, and the goodness mingled with severity which

marked the whole ordering of his condition subsequently, Jehovah is the only proper term. While to make it plain that Jehovah is not a different or inferior deity, but that the God of grace is one with God the Creator, both names are combined, Jehovah Elohim, throughout chs. 2 and 3. Is this appropriate use of these terms merely a lucky accident and wholly undesigned, resulting from the combination of two independent documents, in each of which the names of God are regulated, not by their suitableness to the subject matter, but by the mere habit of the writer?

In ch. 5 the Elohim of v. 1 is adopted from 1:27, and the Jehovah of v. 29 from 3:17; cf. v. 14. The only other divine name in the chapter is Elohim in vs. 22, 24. The phrase "walked with God" is used twice of Enoch and once of Noah, 6:9. As "man of God" is an established expression, while "man of Jehovah" never occurs, so we find "walk before Jehovah," Gen. 24:40, and "walk after Jehovah," Deut. 13:5, but never "walk with Jehovah;" only "walk with God," Mic. 6:8 (note the interchange of divine names in this verse). It is suggestive of the contrast between God and men, holy intercourse with God, not communion with the ungodly world, and so "God took him."

In chs. 6-9 there is an equal appropriateness in the use of the divine names. At the beginning and at the end both names occur in J paragraphs in an instructive manner. It is Jehovah who extends his grace to Noah while resolving to destroy the wicked world; at the same time usage calls for "sons of Elohim" rather than "sons of Jehovah," 6:1-8. Again in 9:26, 27 Jehovah is the God of Shem, the father of the chosen race, but it is Elohim, the God of universal providence and of all mankind, who shall enlarge Japheth.

Throughout the narrative of the flood it is mostly Elohim that is used, because it is God the Creator destroying the works of his own hands, and the God of providence directing the preservation of the various species of living things in the ark and covenanting that all terrestrial creatures shall not be again destroyed by a deluge. It is only when the thought is more especially directed to the saving of Noah's pious house and of clean animals intended for sacrifice, that Jehovah is employed. Thus Jehovah bids them enter the ark, 7:1-5, and shuts them in, v. 16, and accepts Noah's sacrifice, 8:20-22.

In chs. 10-12:5 it is Jehovah, the God of the chosen race, who calls Abram and gives him promises, 12:1 sqq. It is also Jehovah who, in the interest of his plan of grace and of his kingdom on earth, defeats the machinations of the builders of Babel, 11:1-9, and keeps his eye upon Nimrod, the founder of an empire which was the first embodiment of worldly power, 10:9.

This survey of the use of the divine names in the chapters under consideration supplies more than a negative argument. It not only shows that the alternation is readily explicable without the assumption of diverse documents, but it reveals a propriety in their employment which cannot be accidental, and never

could have resulted from piecing together documents independently conceived and written, in each of which one particular name was used irrespective of the subject treated. Whether a like propriety in the use of these names rules in the rest of Genesis or not, is for the present a matter of no concern. The method observable in their employment in the chapters before us, is a fact for which the document hypothesis cannot account.

#### The Divine Names and Language.

But though neither the language of these chapters nor the divine names regarded separately lend any support to the document hypothesis, possibly the case may be altered when they are taken together. It is claimed, p. 67, 2 (2), "that whenever Elohim is used, it is accompanied by a certain series of words, and that it is just so in the use of Yahweh." But really this is not so.

In the first Elohim section (1:1-2:3), of the words and phrases adduced as characteristic, some recur nowhere else in the Hexateuch, others nowhere else in Genesis, and others still in but one other narrative in Genesis, that of the flood, a theme closely related to that of the creation, and here they are found in both its P and J paragraphs. Beyond this there is scarcely a characteristic word or phrase which reappears in another P section of Genesis. The second so-called Elohim section, ch. 5, has, as it has been shown, no right to be so considered. Beyond a few expressions directly borrowed in equal measure from P and J sections, neither ch. 5 nor the kindred genealogy, 11:10-26, contain anything to ally them to any of the P sections.

The next Elohim section, that of the flood, is almost equally detached in point of language from all the succeeding P sections of Genesis. Of the words and phrases here adduced as characteristic a few recur in Gen. ch. 17;\* but beyond this scarcely one is to be found again in P in the rest of Genesis† (creation excepted), not as many, in fact, as reappear in J. In the so-called Elohist portion of chs. 10, 11 and 12:1-5 (though Elohim does not occur in it) there is not one word found elsewhere in P that is not also in J, except רכוש and the cognate verb רכש. The former of these occurs several times in ch. 14, which is universally held not to belong to P; and it is only excluded from E in another passage by critical jugglery.

\* The following are common to the flood and Gen. 17, viz., בדרתיו 17:1; תמים 17:1; הקים ברית 17:4; אני הנה 17:4; ואני הנני 17:7, 9, 12; לררתיכם 17:7, 9, 12; לררתם 17:7, 19, 21; עצם self-same, 17:23, 26; מאד מאד 17:2, 6, 20 (J 30:43); ב distributive, 17:23; "with you and with your seed after you," 17:8, 19, repeated with explicit allusion to this passage, 28:4; 35:12.

† But two are found in P elsewhere in Gen., viz., שחת of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, 19:21 P, repeatedly in J, גוע of the death of patriarchs, 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:33. צוה 21:4 has no significance, besides in Hex. only in J, Ex. 34:4. חיה wild beast only J and E, 37:20, 33. נבר only J 49:26. ירק besides in Hex. only in J and E; "thou and thy sons and thy wife," etc., 6:18; cf. in J 19:12, 16.

With such a state of facts it is the merest delusion for the critics to say that Elohim, wherever it occurs, is always accompanied by the same series of words. They have simply imposed upon themselves by lists of words which are in large part unmeaning, but from which superficial conclusions are drawn with no scrutiny of their real significance and value.

Add to this that in order to maintain their hypothesis the critics find it necessary to assume the existence of two Elohist documents, one of which is so closely related to J in style and conception and so intimately blended with it that it is always extremely difficult and sometimes quite impossible to separate them. This certainly has the appearance of an evasion, which is equivalent to an indirect confession of the futility of the entire hypothesis. We are first told that the text of Genesis must be divided with reference to the names Elohim and Jehovah; and the style and diction of P and J are inferred from the paragraphs respectively assigned to them. We proceed further in the analysis, and lo! Elohim perversely occurs where the criteria of P made out from the early chapters will no longer apply. The critics tell us that this must be a second Elohist. It will be incumbent, however, upon them to make it very plain that the second Elohist is not simply an exigency of their own hypothesis; otherwise it can only be accepted as a reluctant admission that the criteria previously laid down for P are false.

#### **The Divine Names and Theology.**

It is further claimed that if "we divide these chapters into two divisions simply on the basis of the use of the divine names," we shall discover "that each division has its own peculiar and widely different conception of God, etc.," p. 67. 2 (5). If Elohim and Jehovah are words of different signification, and represent the Most High under different aspects of his being, as they manifestly do, they must when used correctly and with regard to their proper meaning, be associated with different conceptions of God. This will not argue a diversity of writers, but simply that the divine name has each time been selected in accordance with the idea to be expressed.

Elohim is the more general and so to speak abstract designation of God as the creator and providential governor of the world at large and of the whole collective mass of mankind. Jehovah is his personal name and that by which he has made himself known when entering into close relations with men, and particularly the chosen race, as the God of revelation and the God of grace. Hence result these three consequences:

1. This intimacy of relationship involves a condescension to man and placing himself in accord with man, which requires anthropomorphisms for its expression and can be made intelligible in no other way.

2. It is to God as Jehovah that man pays his worship; so that when altars and sacrifice and invocation are spoken of, Jehovah is the term proper to be used.

3. It is Jehovah who has established his kingdom amongst men, and who is directing the course of that kingdom so as to further his gracious designs. It is naturally to be expected, therefore, that the unfolding of these plans and opening prophetic glimpses into his designs will be attributed to Jehovah rather than Elohim.

If now the various propositions in which the theology of P and of J are set forth with not a little iteration, be relieved of their exaggerations and inaccuracies and corrected into accordance with the text from which they are professedly drawn, it will be found that they cover just what, as has now been shown, the difference of the divine names calls for; just that and nothing more.

Why God's speaking in the first person plural is "strictly monotheistic" in P 1:26, p. 29 (1), but "not so rigidly" so in J 3:22; 11:7, p. 30 (1), others may be able to explain; I cannot. It is not commonly supposed that God is any the less "an infinite being" for working with means of his own creation, p. 30 (2), than when he works without them. J speaks (2:4) of "Jehovah God's making earth and heaven" with no suggestion of any material. Forming the body of man (2:7) of dust, into which for his sin it was to be again resolved (3:19), and Eve from the rib of Adam (2:22 sqq.) in token of the oneness of their being, demanded as real an exercise of divine power as bidding the earth to bring forth grass and living creatures, 1:12,24. Why Jehovah "causing a strong east wind to blow in order to bring locusts (Ex. 10:13,19), or to drive back the sea (Ex. 14:21)" J, p. 30 (2), is a result brought about "by natural means," when God's making "a wind to pass over the earth and the waters assuaged," 8:1, P, is not "a natural event," but "the fiat of almighty power," p. 50 (5), I do not see. For an illustration of the difficulty which the critics create for themselves on this point, together with a professed answer in which the difficulty is simply ignored, see p. 58 (2).

If no one has "attempted to reconcile ch. 2" with "modern science," p. 30 (2), it cannot be because there was any difficulty in doing it. The chronological arrangement of ch. 1 presents a basis of comparison with geological discoveries which is wanting in the topical arrangement of ch. 2. But man's spiritual kinship with God, and the composition of his body from materials furnished by the inorganic matter of the earth (2:7), his absolute superiority of nature to the brute creation, 2:20, and the inviolability of the marriage relation, 2:24, are the lessons of the chapter; and science may dispute them if it can.

If in J "man is on free and even confidential terms with God," p. 30 (3), this belongs appropriately to Jehovah, as the condescending God of grace who permits and invites men to "come boldly" unto him, Heb. 4:16. But how is it in P, 5:22; 6:9, where Enoch and Noah "walked with God," and 17:18,22, when Abraham talked with God until "God went up from" him, just as in J Jehovah came down from heaven, 11:5; 18:21, and visited men, 18:1 sqq., though all the while in heaven, 19:24? And, how is it that "walking with God" is a



“ phrase which in J would be meaningless,” p. 38 (4), when “ walking before Jehovah ” is the phrase by which Abraham’s pious life is described, 24:40 ? The irony with which, 3:22, the words of the tempter, 3:5, are repeated as fulfilled in a disastrous sense, does not imply that man had gained a “ superhuman attribute ” by eating the forbidden fruit, p. 30 (4). Cain’s fear is not that “ Jehovah cannot protect him,” 4:14, but that he will not. The angel disabled Jacob’s thigh by a touch, 32:25, not “ because he was likely to prevail,” but to show him how impotent he really was. The suggestion respecting 3:8 and 2:21, p. 31 (5), is too trivial for a serious reply. If “ in 11:5 ; 18:20–22 God is represented as resorting to personal inspection to ascertain something of which he is ignorant,” the same is the case in Ps. 14:2 and even in Ps. 139:23,24, where it is attached to the most exalted description in human language of the omnipresence and the omniscience of the infinite God. There is not the slightest inconsistency between the anthropomorphisms of J and the lofty conceptions of P. They abound alike in the Psalms and are freely intermingled in their devout utterances. With one breath the Psalmist speaks of God as knowing the secrets of the heart, 44:22, and with the next calls upon him “ Awake, why sleepest thou ? ” v. 24.

It should be observed further that P has his anthropomorphisms likewise, and that even in ch. 1 with all its grandeur and simplicity. Each creative fiat is uttered in human language, 1:3,6 sqq. God “ called the light □’,” 1:5, giving Hebrew names to that and various other objects. He “ saw the light that it was good ” 1:4, thus inspecting the work of each day and pronouncing upon its quality. He uttered a formula of blessing upon the various orders of living things, 1:22,28. He deliberated with himself prior to the creation of man, 1:26. Man was made “ in the image of God,” an expression which has been wrested to imply a material form. Time was spent upon the work ; and this was parceled into six successive days like so many working periods of men. When the work was done, God rested on the seventh day, 2:2 ; and thus the week was completed, again a human measure of time. All this is anthropomorphic. He who would speak intelligently to finite comprehension of the infinite God, must use anthropomorphisms. The difference after all is not of kind but of degree.

The statement is repeatedly made that according to P sacrifices had no existence before the time of Moses, p. 38 (2 and 4), 50 (3), 51 (3). This is altogether unwarranted. No affirmation of the sort is made in any section attributed to P ; nor is any declaration made that is inconsistent with the prior existence of sacrifices. The whole truth in the case is that Jehovah, being the personal name of God and the name under which he is worshiped, this name is preferably employed when sacrifice is mentioned or alluded to ; so that the absence of reference to sacrifice in Elohim sections is sufficiently accounted for. And yet Elohim directs Abraham to offer Isaac as a burnt-offering, 22:2 sqq., and Jacob offers sacrifices to Elohim, 46:1. If the critics refer these to a second Elohist, because

P never mentions sacrifice; and then argue that P never mentions sacrifice, since these passages belong to E and not to P, is not that a circular style of reasoning?

Besides, the existence of sacrifice is implied, as before suggested, in the prohibition of eating blood, 9:4. And it is well worthy of consideration whether it is not also implied in the rite of circumcision, 17:10 sqq. If this be, as Ewald supposes, in its original idea, "a blood-offering," it shows a familiarity with the conception of expiation by the shedding of blood, out of which it sprung. Or if it be explained with Schultz,\* as "a consecration of the life to God by a painful and bloody purification," it at least involves the idea of the clean and unclean and purgation by blood.

Argument would be easier and more satisfactory, if random remarks were avoided, and nothing imputed to the writers of Scripture which is not in their words either explicitly or by fair implication. In addition to corrections previously made, p. 38 (3) has no foundation in the original record: "J seems to think that Cain should have had more knowledge than he exhibits. He should have known that Yahweh prefers a bloody offering." This neither agrees with (2) immediately above, nor with the reason given for the rejection of Cain's offering, 4:7. "He favors those who dwell in tents and have cattle, and looks with suspicion on the man of the field"; how does this agree with Adam being referred for his subsistence to "the herb of the field," 3:18, and "the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle," 4:20, being traced to the apostate line of Cain? And where does J express any opinion about "the Rechabite"? or object to "sowing or reaping," cf. 26:12; 27:27,28? or to "agriculture," which is contemplated in every promise of the land of Canaan and implied in the legislation attributed to J, Ex. 34:18 sqq.? or show any disposition to "cling to the old pastoral life," whereas the sentence pronounced upon the people for their sin, Num. 14:33 J (Heb.), is "Your children shall be shepherds in the wilderness forty years"?

#### Diversity of Style.

The stately account of the creation, ch. 1, is compared with the narrative that follows chs. 2,3, pp. 25-27; or the genealogy from Adam to Noah, ch. 5, with the story of Cain and Abel, ch. 4, pp. 33,34, and the conclusion is drawn that P is chronological, statistical, stereotyped and repetitious, while J is free and flowing, vivid and picturesque. With the same propriety a bill presented by a merchant to his customer might be compared with a letter written to his wife and diversity of authorship inferred, because one deals in dates and figures and business forms and the other in easy flowing sentences. If two narratives of like character be compared with fairness and candor, the alleged diversities will disappear. It is curious to observe how different critics vary in their judgment respecting style, showing that a subjective element enters largely into their opinions. Thus Eich-

\**Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 401.

horn\* holds a very different view of these writers from that suggested above. In his opinion P in ch. 1 exhibits high art and a carefully arranged and admirably executed plan; every word is so nicely weighed that the same formulæ can be used successively in the various scenes which he portrays. J in chs. 2,3, is a less skillful and practiced writer.

The only section in which there is a reasonable opportunity for a comparison of style is that of the flood. And a moment's examination will show that the judgment passed upon it (p. 45) is purely subjective, not elicited from the passage itself, but obtruded upon it. The style of P is said to be

“(1) Characterized by a systematic arrangement of material, as is seen in (a) the introduction, ‘These are the generations,’ etc. [it has been shown that this belongs not to the P sections in particular, but to the plan of the book in its completed form]; (b) the five months of increase of flood; (c) the five months of decrease [but compare the forty days, 7:4,12, and forty days, 8:6; the seven days, 7:4,10, and seven days, 8:10,12]; (d) the gradual leading up to the Noachic covenant (9:1-17) [but compare the preparation (7:2,3,8) for the sacrifice, 8:20] the law of bloodshed which is given in such detail as to show that it is a point of greatest importance in the writer's mind [but compare what is said, p. 39 (4), of J's presentation of the guilt of the murderer]; (e) the return to the formula of ch. 5 in 9:28,29 [as already shown the history of the flood is simply inserted in the body of the genealogy; having completed the former, he again takes up the latter where he left it].”

“(2) Is minute, chronological, scientific, as seen in (a) the calculation of the age of Noah, 7:6,11 [v. 6 is enclosed in a J paragraph and only cut out and assigned to P because of this calculation; v. 11 adjoins a J paragraph and might just as easily have been attached to it, if the critics had chosen], 9:28,29 [already explained]; (b)-(h) [7:1 implies a previous mention of the ark. If J is an independent and continuous document, it must have given an account of the ark which has been omitted. Where is the evidence that this was less detailed and minute?]; (i) the rigid classification in 6:18; 7:13 [exactly the same in 7:7, the reference of which to R is mere evasion]; (j) the classes of animals in 6:20, etc. [so 6:7; 7:8, 23; in v. 23 the enumeration is transferred to P, though it carries with it **ימחו** claimed as a criterion of J, p. 46 (3)]; (k) the use of **למינו**, **זכר ונקבה**, **למשפחותיהם**, etc. [previously explained: “male and female” in J 7:3,9]; (l) the trouble taken to declare the absolute universality of the flood [the evidence adduced in the note is 7:19-23, and the words attributed to J in these verses are as sweeping and universal as the rest. “The high mountains under the whole heaven,” v. 19, by any reasonable principle of interpretation mean neither the Andes nor the Himalayas, but all within the scope of Noah's vision and perhaps

\* *Repertorium für Bibl. und Morgenländ. Literatur*, part 4, pp. 137,174.

the writer's knowledge. The flood was universal enough to accomplish its purpose, 6:7. The way in which it was brought about is explained 7:11,12. The ocean rushed in upon the land in consequence no doubt of the subsidence of the latter, and torrents poured down from the skies. At length the flow of the ocean ceased and its waters retreated (8:2) from the emergence of the land. All is in harmony with geologic laws and admitted facts]; (m) the legal phraseology of 9:4-6 [previously explained]."

And all the rest that is adduced on this subject is of the same nature.

### CONCLUSION.

The matter contained in the sections respectively attributed to J and to P in the chapters now under consideration, is on p. 65 summed up under nine heads practically identical in both and treated in the same order. Such a remarkable correspondence throughout makes it impossible to conceive that these represent two entirely independent documents. The discrepancies and contradictions alleged to prove diversity of authorship do not exist; and if they did, they would make the work of the Redactor inconceivable. There is not a duplicate account of the creation, nor of the line of descent from Adam to the existing race of mankind, nor of the deluge. There are no such differences of language between the sections of J and P, as require the assumption of a diversity of writers. The alternation of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah can be explained without that assumption. The alleged difference of style is factitious. The difference in theological conceptions is linked with the signification and usage of Elohim and Jehovah, the selection of the name having been made (so far as we have yet gone) in accordance with the thought to be conveyed, and so far from the same series of words being invariably attendant upon Elohim and Jehovah respectively, the characteristic P expressions in the account of the creation and the deluge are conspicuously absent from every other P section in Genesis, except ch. 17, the covenant of circumcision with Abraham.

If the current critical hypothesis has any ground to rest upon in Gen. 1:1-12:5, we have not been able to find it. The "grave doubts" of Prof. Reuss, the venerable father of this hypothesis in its present form (*Geschichte d. A. T.*, p. 255), whether any of the sections attributed to the work of the Jehovist prior to Gen. 12, really belonged to it, have been confirmed by our examination. Whether any thing after Gen. 12 belonged to it, must be a matter for future inquiry.

The present article has not been written in the interest of any particular hypothesis of the origin of Genesis. No hypothesis on that subject has been propounded or defended. We have simply inquired into the strength of the arguments adduced in favor of the solution offered by the critics, and have found them wanting. We are conscious of no antecedent bias against a critical analysis of the Book of Genesis, and its partition among different writers, if

that can be fairly established. No prejudice need thence arise against Moses being the author or at least the editor of the book. The remark p. 70 (6) is certainly over-hasty: "If there is an analysis, even these chapters furnish enough to show that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch; for, *if Gen. 1-12 was written long after Moses' death*, it is presumable that the other portions of the Hexateuch which follow and connect with these chapters belong also to a later date." Not a word has yet been said tending to establish the hypothetical clause italicized above. No argument urged in favor of the analysis of Genesis would affect the question of its Mosaic composition, but such as are inconsistent with the honesty or capacity of the Redactor, and those are suicidal to the hypothesis itself.

If now, without positively committing ourselves at this stage of the discussion, the facts thus far developed may be allowed to shape themselves in the direction of some definite issue, may it not be said that the present indications seem to favor something like the old Vitringa hypothesis? Moses was in possession of some ancient genealogical registers, preserved among his people from their ancestors. And the alternation of יְלֵךְ and הָיָלָךְ may possibly, as Kurtz\* long ago suspected, be traceable to the varying forms of expression in these old registers. Besides this the story of the creation and the flood and the covenant with Abraham, ch. 17, seem to be bound together by their diction in a very peculiar manner. These great outstanding facts, whether reduced to writing or gaining a fixed form by oral repetition, filled the soul of the ardent young Hebrew, as they were read to him or told to him in his boyhood by his mother or the men of his nation. And these old stories shine through his narrative, just as his Egyptian training shines out in his laws, without its being possible in either case to exactly reproduce by a critical process from what he has written, just what he had heard or had been taught.

The peculiar use of the divine names in Genesis points likewise to the same conclusion. It finds its only adequate explanation not in the mechanical assumption of the blending of two documents representing different ideas of the origin of the name Jehovah, but of one writer standing at the point of transition from the old to the new, himself the leader in that great crisis in which this sacred name assumed a prominence and gained a fullness of meaning unknown before, and to whom its significance had been unfolded by the Lord himself. Genesis

---

\* *Die Einheit der Genesis* (Berlin, 1846), p. 32. I cannot too strongly recommend this masterly treatise to those who are studying the critical partition of the Pentateuch. The supplementary hypothesis was then in vogue and its arguments are specially directed against it; but they are equally valid against any other form of critical division. The distinguished author was unfortunately induced subsequently to accept a compromise, proposed with the best intentions, which yielded the direct Mosaic authorship, but insisted on the substantially Mosaic character of the contents of the Pentateuch. The subsequent course of Pentateuch criticism in Germany has shown that this was a mistake. If evangelical critics in that country had stood upon the line of defense so ably drawn out by Kurtz, and made their advances from it, they would occupy a far stronger position and maintain a more hopeful attitude than they do at present.

reflects a time prior to that in which this name had practically superseded every other appellation of the Most High, and was habitually used of the true God in every aspect of his being. It is employed with nice discrimination, and by one who, while he delights to trace Israel's covenant God in even the first buddings of his scheme of grace and through all its successive stages, is at the same time near enough to the patriarchal age to have had some of the divine transactions, by which it was characterized, traditionally conveyed to him in the exact form in which they originally took place.

One word, in closing, as to "Hasisadra," p. 62. There are striking points of correspondence between the deluge tablets and the Bible narrative which have their interest and importance. But only he can consistently maintain that the latter is borrowed from the former, who fancies that genuine coin is an attempted imitation of the spurious, and that pure drugs were originated as rivals of the adulterated article. My own private opinion on the subject corresponds with that of Zophar, the Naamathite, respecting the Darwinian hypothesis. When he would say in the most emphatic manner that a thing is impossible, he says that it may take place "when a wild ass's colt is born a man," Job 11:12.\*

---

#### ERRATA.

On p. 138, the first half of the seventh line from the bottom ought to read, "but on the conjectures of the critics." So in copy.

On p. 157, in the second line of the second column of small type, it will be readily seen that ורכו should be ורכו.

---

\* The second article by Professor Harper will be published in the July number of *HEBRAICA*.